BOSTON UNIVERSITY

GRADUATE SCHOOL

Dissertation

THE RELATION OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM TO HIS ETHICS

by

William Emory Hartman

(A. B., Ohio Wesleyan University, 1921; S. T. B., Boston University School of Theology, 1924)

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

1935

THE RELATION OF PAUL'S MYSTICISM TO HIS ETHICS

THE RELATION OF PAUL'S MINISTRY TO HIS MINDS

OUTLINE

Chapter I

Introduction

Statement of the Problem and Review of the Work of Other Investigators

Chapter II

Mysticism and Religion

Chapter III

Mysticism and Ethics

Chapter IV

The Mystical Element in Paul: The Damascus Experience

Chapter IV

The Spiritual Element in Yeats: The Paradoxes Experience

Chapter V

The Mystical Element in Paul: Post-Conversion Experience

Chapter V

The Spiritual Element in Faust: Post-conversion experiences

Chapter VI

The Ethical Element in Paul

Chapter VII

Paul's Personal Religious Problem and Its Bearing upon His Moral Experience

Chapter VII

Paul's Personal Religious Problem and Its Bearing upon His Moral Experience

Chapter VIII

The Relation of Paul's Mysticism to His Ethical Teaching

Chapter VIII

The Relation of Paul's Apostleship to His Ethical Teaching

Chapter IX

The Mystico-Ethical Formulation of Paul's Practical Teaching

Chapter X

Chapter I

Introduction

Statement of the Problem and Review of the Work of Other Investigators.

The Problem What has mystical experience to do with ethical conduct? What is the relation of that rare and refined experience of the divine called mysticism to the practical conduct of the good life? Out of this fundamental question which has at sometime presented itself to every thoughtful student of religious mysticism the present thesis grows. The religious experience of Paul is a rich field for the prosecution of such an inquiry. The records of his life and teachings offer on the one hand indications of a well-defined type of mystical experience and on the other signs of deep concern for the ethical conduct of life. Our problem is to discover and to characterize the relation of the mystical to the ethical element in Paul.

Plan of Approach Our plan of approach is as follows. Following a review of the work of other investigators on Paul's mysticism and ethics, which will occupy the remainder of the present chapter, we shall establish in as precise form as possible the meaning of the mystical element in religion. We shall then examine the relation of mysticism to ethics. These two preliminary studies, comprising chapters II and III, will serve as a background against which the specific problem of the mystical and ethical elements in Paul's experience, and the relation of those elements, may be understood.

The first step in the development of the thesis proper will then be the characterization of the mystical element in the religious experience of Paul. Since this thesis is

The Problem What has mystical experience to do with ethical conduct? What is the relation of that rare and refined experience of the divine called mysticism to the practical conduct of the good life? Out of this fundamental question which has at sometime presented itself to every thoughtful student of religion mysticism the present thesis grows. The religious experience of Paul is a rich field for the prosecution of such an inquiry. The records of his life and teachings offer on the one hand indications of a well-defined type of mystical experience and on the other signs of deep concern for the ethical conduct of life. <u>Our problem is to discover and to characterize the relation of the mystical to the ethical element in Paul.</u>

Plan of Approach Our plan of approach is as follows.

Following a review of the work of other investigators on Paul's mysticism and ethics, which will occupy the remainder of the present chapter, we shall establish in as precise form as possible the meaning of the mystical element in religion. We shall then examine the relation of mysticism to ethics. These two preliminary studies, comprising chapters II and III, will serve as a background against which the specific problem of the mystical and ethical elements in Paul's experience, and the relation of those elements, may be understood.

The first step in the development of the thesis proper will then be the characterization of the mystical element in the religious experience of Paul. Since this thesis is

pursued as a New Testament study, it is at this point that we first examine the original New Testament sources, the book of The Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of Paul.[1] From these sources we shall select in the first instance those expressions which reflect the mystical element in Paul's experience, with an eye to determining its character. This study will embrace Chapters IV and V.

The second step is the characterization of the ethical element in Paul. Here we shall seek to determine the specific nature of Paul's ethical interest by an inquiry into the life situations of both Paul and his converts out of which his ethical reflection and moral teaching grow. This study comprises Chapter VI.

Thus Chapters IV, V, and VI will present the problem by throwing into relief the two elements which are character-

---

1 Though the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles has frequently been questioned, the four major Epistles, Romans, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, have been recognized as authentic even by the Tübingen school. The authenticity of the remaining Epistles is more debatable. Arguments for the non-Pauline character of Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, I and II Thessalonians, and Philemon appear inconclusive. The Pastorals offer more serious objections to Pauline authorship, but in view of the balance of evidence for and against, we shall refrain from excluding them from the corpus of the Pauline writings. However, this thesis draws little material from the Pastorals.

pursued in a New Testament study. It is at this point that we first examine the original New Testament sources, the book of the Acts of the Apostles and the epistles of Paul.[1] From these sources we shall select in the first instance those expressions which reflect the mystical element in Paul's experience, with an eye to determining its character. This study will embrace Chapters IV and V.

The second step is the characterization of the ethical element in Paul. Here we shall seek to determine the specific nature of Paul's ethical interest by an inquiry into the life situations of both Paul and his converts out of which his ethical reflection and moral teaching grew. This study comprises Chapter VI.

Thus Chapters IV, V, and VI will present the problem by throwing into relief the two elements which are character-

---

1 Though the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles has frequently been questioned, the four major Epistles, Romans, Galatians, I and II Corinthians, have been recognized as authentic even by the Tubingen school. The authenticity of the remaining Epistles is more debatable. Arguments for the non-Pauline character of Colossians, Ephesians, Philippians, I and II Thessalonians, and Philemon appear inconclusive. The Pastorals offer more serious objections to Pauline authorship, but in view of the balance of evidence for and against, we shall refrain from excluding them from the corpus of the Pauline writings. However, this thesis draws little material from the Pastorals.

istic of Paul's religious experience.

The third step is the characterization of the relation of these two elements, or the solution of the problem. In Chapter VII we shall study the fundamental religious problem of Paul, and show its bearing on his personal moral experience; in Chapter VIII we shall characterize the relation of his mysticism to his ethical teaching. Chapter IX will amplify and illustrate the conclusions reached in Chapter VIII. Finally, we shall summarize the fundamental propositions of the thesis in Chapter X.

Review of the Work of Other Investigators

(A)
On the Mystical Element in Paul

The original impetus to the interpretation of the religious experience of Paul as mystical was given by Adolph Deissmann, then of Heidelberg, and now of Berlin, through the publication of a little pamphlet on Paul's use of the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ.[1] In two later books[2] Deissmann elaborated his interpretation, bringing it to conclusion in the

---

1 Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu', Marburg, 1892. (Now published by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen.)

2 Paulus, Eine kultur - und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze, Erste Aufl., 1911; Tr. by L. R. M. Strachan, Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History, London; Zw. Aufl., Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1925. Tr. by W. E. Wilson, and published under title of first English edition, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.

The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, (Selly Oak Lectures, 1923) Tr. by W. E. Wilson, N.Y: Doran, 1923.

ratio of Fenn's religious experience.

The third step is the characterization of the relation of these two elements, or the solution of the problem. In Chapter VII we shall study the fundamental religious problem of Fenn, and show its bearing on his personal moral experiences; in Chapter VIII we shall characterize the relation of his aspirations to his ethical teaching. Chapter IX will amplify and illustrate the conclusions reached in Chapter VIII. Finally, we shall summarize the fundamental propositions of the thesis in Chapter X.

Review of the Work of Other Investigators

(A)
On the Mystical Element in Fenn

The original impetus to the interpretation of the religious experience of Fenn as mystical was given by Adolph Salzmann, then of Heidelberg, and now of Berlin, through the publication of a little pamphlet on Fenn's use of the phrase ev Χριστῷ.[1] In two later books[2] Salzmann elaborated his interpretation, bringing it to conclusion in the

---

1 Die mystemenntliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu', Marburg, 1922. (Now published by J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen.)

2 Fenn, Eine Mutter - und religionspsychologische Studie. Kirche Jesu, 1911; Tr. by E. M. Strachan, Fenn. A Study in Social and Religious History, London; Sw. Auff., Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck), 1922. Tr. by W. E. Wilson, and published under title of first English edition, London: Sadler and Stoughton, 1926.

The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, (Gally Oak Lectures, 1923) Tr. by W. E. Wilson, N.Y.: Doran, 1923.

second edition of his Paulus, published in 1925. Though Deissmann's work evoked at first considerable protest, it has won during the past twenty years a fair degree of acceptance. At least it is fair to say that today no study of the experience of Paul is regarded complete without due consideration being given to the position that his experience is to be understood in terms of mysticism.[1] Before tracing the development of Deissmann's interpretation in the writings of other scholars, we shall state briefly his theory.

Deissmann on the Mystical Element in Paul

Deissmann insists that Paul must be viewed primarily as a religionist, and not as a theologian. The doctrinaire method of dealing with Paul so popular in the nineteenth century failed to reveal his true religious nature. The attempt to establish Paulinism as a theological system transferred Paul from his original sphere of vital religion into the secondary sphere of theology; it removed him from the realm of intuitive simplicity to the realm of reflection, which

---

1 For example, H. J. Cadbury, in an essay "Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion," in S. J. Case's Studies in Early Christianity, pp. 369-389, lists as sixth, and possibly most important, among the "categories of Paul's religious thinking" the mystical. Cadbury quotes Deissmann, (pp. 387-388) and approximates his general position throughout. So also, C. A. A. Scott, in his Living Issues in the New Testament, 1933, et al.

second edition of his *Pauline*, published in 1925. Though Deissmann's work evoked at first considerable protest, it has won during the past twenty years a fair degree of acceptance. At least it is fair to say that today no study of the experience of Paul is regarded complete without due consideration being given to the position that his experience is to be understood in terms of mysticism.[1] Before tracing the development of Deissmann's interpretation in the writings of other scholars, we shall state briefly his theory.

Deissmann on the Mystical Element in Paul

Deissmann insists that Paul must be viewed primarily as a religionist, and not as a theologian. The doctrinaire method of dealing with Paul so popular in the nineteenth century failed to reveal his true religious nature. The attempt to establish Paulinism as a theological system transferred Paul from his original sphere of vital religion into the secondary sphere of theology; it removed him from the realm of intuitive simplicity to the realm of reflection, which

---

1 For example, H. L. Goudge, in an essay "Contemporary Phases of Paul's Religion," in E. J. Case's *Studies in Early Christianity*, pp. 369-389, lists as sixth, and possibly most important, among the "categories of Paul's religious thinking" the *mystical*. Goudge quotes Deissmann, (pp. 387-388) and approximates his general position throughout. Cf also, G. A. A. Scott, *In his Living Lords in the New Testament*, 1938, et al.

is historically not his creative sphere. The real Paul is a man of religion.

Paul's mysticism is to be understood in terms of his communion with the living, exalted Christ.

Deissmann distinguishes between two types of mysticism: Mysticismus, in which the subject seeks absorption by deity, and Mystik, in which is included every religious tendency that discovers the way to God direct through inner experience without the mediation of reasoning, and of which the constitutive element is immediacy of contact with the divine.[1] Moreover, Deissmann distinguishes between acting and reacting mysticism. The former is a type of mystical experience in which the initiative is with man and the end is union with God; the latter places the initiative with God, and characterizes the experience of the subject in whom God works as reaction to God. The former type leads to "aesthetic intoxication";[2] the latter to ethical enthusiasm.

Paul's mysticism deserves to be reckoned Mystik and reaction, rather than Mysticismus and action. It is a religion not of works, but of grace. Paul does not experience union and absorption, but communion and power.

---

1 Paul, p. 149. 2 Paul, p. 151.

is historically not his creative sphere. The real Paul is a man of religion.

Paul's mysticism is to be understood in terms of his communion with the living, exalted Christ.

Deissmann distinguishes between two types of mysticism: *Mystic-union*, in which the subject seeks absorption by deity, and *Mystic*, in which is included every religious tendency that discovers the way to God direct through inner experience without the mediation of reasoning, and of which the constitutive element is immediacy of contact with the divine.[1] Moreover, Deissmann distinguishes between *nature* and *ecstatic* mysticism. The former is a type of mystical experience in which the initiative is with man and the end is union with God; the latter places the initiative with God, and characterizes the experience of the subject in whom God works an reaction to God. The former type leads to "mechanistic intoxication"[2]; the latter to ethical enthusiasm.

Paul's mysticism deserves to be renamed *Mystic* and reaction, rather than *Mysticism* and action. It is a religion not of works, but of grace. Paul does not experience union and absorption, but communion and power.

---

1 *Paul*, p. 142. 2 *Paul*, p. 181.

The Christophany near Damascus is the basic religious experience of Paul. Here the exalted Christ appeared to him in transforming power, and began in him that indwelling life which motivated all his subsequent conduct. Paul's Christ-mysticism ("Christ is in Paul, Paul is in Christ")[1] is to be conceived as fellowship with Christ, or Christ-intimacy. This fellowship is not the product of a number of convictions and elevated doctrines about Christ. It is dynamic experience, through which Paul is commissioned, illumined, energized.

When Paul describes this experience of Christ he resorts to one type of expression which Deissmann believes to be of peculiar significance: ἐν Χριστῷ . This phrase is the technical formula for Pauline mysticism. It designates the most intimate kind of fellowship of the believer with the living spiritual Christ. When Paul speaks of being ἐν Χριστῷ, he is offering a confession that springs from the depths of his being.

Since Paul is a reacting mystic, his experience of Christ is brought about by the initiative of God. The Christophany of Damascus was God's good-pleasure. God is the giver of the Spirit by and in which Paul lives.

Having laid the groundwork for an understanding of Paul's religion, Deissmann proceeds to discuss several aspects

---

1 Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 187.

The Christophany near Damascus is the basic religious experience of Paul. Here the exalted Christ appeared to him in transforming power, and began in him that indwelling life which motivated all his subsequent conduct. Paul's Christ-mysticism ("Christ is in Paul, Paul is in Christ")[1] is to be conceived as fellowship with Christ, or Christ-intimacy. This fellowship is not the product of a number of convictions and elevated doctrines about Christ. It is dynamic experience, through which Paul is commissioned, illumined, energized.

When Paul describes this experience of Christ he resorts to one type of expression which Deissmann believed to be of peculiar significance: ἐν Χριστῷ. This phrase is the technical formula for Pauline mysticism. It designates the most intimate kind of fellowship of the believer with the living spiritual Christ. When Paul speaks of being ἐν Χριστῷ, he is offering a confession that springs from the depths of his being.

Since Paul is a rapturing mystic, his experience of Christ is brought about by the initiative of God. The Christophany of Damascus was God's good-pleasure. God is the giver of the Spirit by and in which Paul lives.

Having laid the groundwork for an understanding of Paul's religion, Deissmann proceeds to discuss several aspects

---

1. Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 187.

of Paul's thought and experience. The "new creation" is the new judgment of himself to which Paul came ἐν Χριστῷ ; he is thenceforth liberated from the law and the flesh and sin, freed from fellowship with Adam; he is the recipient of grace. Paul's faith is union with God, through fellowship with Jesus Christ.[1] Through faith the abundant power of Christ flows into his being. Faith is the center of energy from which all Paul's confessions concerning salvation in Christ radiate. Sanctification, justification, redemption, adoption, are not dogmatic concepts, but illustrations of Paul's genius for casting his experience of Christ in thought forms suitable to the psychological environment of his readers.

Deissmann's view of Paul's relation to the historic Jesus is conditioned by his strong desire to establish the fact of Paul's fellowship with the exalted Christ. Deissmann's treatment here shows his reaction to those scholars who insist that Paul's gospel refers directly to the Jesus of history. While admitting that Paul had definite knowledge of the facts of Jesus' life and teaching, and was influenced by the tradition of the words of Jesus, Deissmann contends that Paul's experience is of a Christ who is Jesus liberated from the flesh, a Christ who is the object of mystical fellowship.

---

1 Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 206.

of Paul's thought and experience. The "new creation" is the new judgment of himself to which Paul came ; he is thence-forth liberated from the law and the flesh and sin, freed from fellowship with Adam; he is the realized of grace. Paul's faith is union with God, through fellowship with Jesus Christ.[1] Through faith the abundant power of Christ flows into his being. Faith is the center of energy from which all Paul's consciousness concerning salvation in Christ radiate. Sanctification, justification, redemption, adoption, are not domestic concepts. But illuminations of Paul's genius for conceiving his experiences of Christ in thought forms suitable to the psychological environment of his readers.

Deissmann's view of Paul's relation to the historic Jesus is conditioned by his strong desire to establish the fact of Paul's fellowship with the exalted Christ. Deissmann's treatment here shows his reaction to those scholars who insist that Paul's gospel refers directly to the Jesus of history. While admitting that Paul had definite knowledge of the facts of Jesus' life and teaching, and was influenced by the tradition of the words of Jesus, Deissmann contends that Paul's experience is of a Christ who is Jesus liberated from the flesh, a Christ who is the object of mystical fellowship.

---

1 Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 295.

Deissmann definitely relates the ethical and mystical elements in Paul. He holds that Paul's ethical heritage from Judaism received its peculiar brilliance through his Christ-mysticism; the ethical element is anchored in his experience ἐν Χριστῷ, and finds expression in an energized will. The love of Christ is the individual and the social power for good.[1] Paul's social ethics is unmistakably religious in tone.

Deissmann summarizes his interpretation of the mystical element in Paul as follows:

> His Christ-mysticism, which was in its origin a reaction to revealed grace, and in its nature Christ-intimacy, a mysticism of fellowship, not of oneness with its object, ethical, not indifferent, but in the highest degree active - this mysticism, though centered in Christ, did not exclude the living God, but rather disclosed Him as Holy Love, and secured access to His redemptive and re-creative grace.[2]

There are certain <u>limitations</u> in Deissmann's interpretation of Paul's mysticism. As a pioneer in this type of interpretation, he is of necessity restricted to a sketch of the trunk-lines of interpretation; he does not conduct a critical analysis of the original sources, or work through the various aspects of Paul's mysticism in exhaustive fashion. This is due to his method of approach, and is to be regarded as

---

1 <u>Paul</u>, p. 208. 2 <u>Paul</u>, pp. 255-256.

Delamarre definitely relates the ethical and mystical elements in Paul. He holds that Paul's ethical heritage from Judaism received its peculiar brilliance through his Christ-mysticism; the ethical element is anchored in his experience of Christ, and finds expression in an energized will. The love of Christ in the individual and the social power for good.[1] Paul's social ethics is unmistakably religious in tone.

Delamarre summarizes his interpretation of the mystical element in Paul as follows:

> His Christ-mysticism, which was in its origin a revelation to revealed grace, and in its nature Christ-initiatory, a mysticism of fellowship, not of oneness with its object, ethical, not indifferent, but in the highest degree active - this mysticism, though centered in Christ, did not crucify the living God, but rather disclosed Him as Holy Love, and secured access to His redemptive and re-creative grace.[2]

There are certain limitations in Delamarre's interpretation of Paul's mysticism. As a pioneer in this type of interpretation, he is of necessity restricted to a study of the trunk-lines of interpretation; he does not construct a critical analysis of the original sources, or work through the various aspects of Paul's mysticism in exhaustive fashion. This is due to his method of approach, and is to be regarded as

---

1 Paul, c. 206. 2 Paul, pp. 222-224.

a limitation rather than a defect. Second, his definition of Christ in terms of Spirit, and Spirit in terms of "some light, ethereal form of existence",[1] though evidently intended metaphorically, has produced ambiguity and confusion. Of this we shall speak more fully in Chapter V. Third, Deissmann attempts no extended explanation of mystical fellowship, and leaves us in some confusion as to what he really conceives it to be. He defines it as pneumatic, and sometimes gives the impression that the believer is located in some spiritual form of existence. He avoids reference to a person-to-person relationship.

But the limitations of Deissmann's study are far outweighed by its points of strength. Once for all he liberates Paul from the narrow realm of theological dogmatism, and sets him in his native sphere of religion. He emphasizes the primacy of the religious consciousness of Paul as compared with his speculative interests. He reveals the religious genius of Paul, and shows how, by personal endowment and religious training, he was fitted for the type of mystical experience he attained. He is quick to distinguish wholesome from unwholesome mysticism, and to identify Paul's experience with the former. He is careful to point out the significance of the ethical element in Paul. His treatment of Paul's eschatology, his attitude toward the sacraments, and the various phases of Paul's thought on salvation, appear to us to be both incisive and sound.

---

1 Paul, p. 142.

a limitation rather than a defect. Second, his definition of Christ in terms of Spirit, and Spirit in terms of "some light, ethereal form of existence,"[1] though evidently intended metaphorically, has produced ambiguity and confusion. Of this we shall speak more fully in Chapter V. Third, Delsemme attempts no extended explanation of mystical fellowship, and leaves us in some confusion as to what he really conceives it to be. He defines it as pneumatic, and sometimes gives the impression that the believer is located in some spiritual form of existence. He avoids reference to a person-to-person relationship.

But the limitations of Delsemme's study are far outweighed by its points of strength. Once for all he liberates Paul from the narrow realm of theological domesticism, and sets him in his native sphere of religion. He emphasizes the primacy of the religious consciousness of Paul as compared with his speculative interests. He reveals the religious genius of Paul, and shows how, by personal endowment and religious training, he was fitted for the type of mystical experience he attained. He is quick to distinguish wonderfully from numerous variations, and to identify Paul's experience with the former. He is careful to point out the significance of the ethical element in Paul. His treatment of Paul's eschatology, his attitude toward the sacraments, and the various phases of Paul's thought on salvation, appear to me to be both incisive and sound.

---

1 Paul, p. 142.

Sommerlath Sommerlath makes two interesting points of emphasis and one distinct contribution in his study of Paul's experience. He emphasizes 1) that though the objective ground of Paul's mysticism must be regarded as God, Paul's mystical apprehension of God was in the figure of Christ. The pattern of his mysticism thus differs from that of the later mystics.

> Das Vorbild Gottes tritt vielmehr für Paulus ganz im Vorbild Christi in die Erschienung.[1]

Sommerlath points to Paul's statements in Ephesians and Colossians: πάντα καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν Χριστός [2] and καθὼς καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς,[3] as demonstrating this contention. The Christ of Paul, however, was one with the Jesus of history, and bears his moral character. At this point Sommerlath draws freely from the excellent work of Johannes Weiss.[4] 2) Sommerlath emphasizes the supernatural origin of the new life of believers. The grace of God, not the will of man, is the driving force in Paul's and believers' experience.[5] But the distinct contribution which

---

1 Op. cit. S. 16. 2 Col. 3:11. 3 Eph. 5:2.

4 Cf. J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus.

5 In all der mannigfalten Motiverung des Christenstandes, die Paulus anwendet, kommt doch immer wieder zum Ausdruck, das Massgebend zuletzt nicht ist, was der Mensch als Grundsatz erwählt, was er tut, und wozu er die Kräfte hätte, sondern was Gott will und was Gott vor allem Tun der Menschengetan hat....das Triebende liegt ausser ihm, in Tun Gottes. Op. cit. S. 19.

Sommerlath discovers two interesting points of emphasis and one distinct contribution in his study of Paul's experience. He regards[1] that though the objective ground of Paul's mysticism must be regarded as God. Paul's mystical apprehension of God was in the figure of Christ. The pattern of his mysticism thus differs from that of the later mystics.

> Das Vorbild Gottes trieb vielmehr
> für Paulus ganz im Vorbild Christi
> in die Erscheinung.[2]

Sommerlath points to Paul's statements in Ephesians and Colossians: "Christ as an Image of God" and "God as a Power," as demonstrating this contention. The Christ of Paul, however, was one with the Jesus of history, and bears his moral character. At this point Sommerlath draws freely from the excellent work of Johannes Weiss.[3] 2) Sommerlath emphasizes the supernatural origin of the new life of believers. The grace of God, not the will of man, is the driving force in Paul's and believers' experience.[4] But the distinct contribution which

---

1 Op. cit. S. 16. 2 Ibid. S:11. 3 Op. cit. S:3.

4 Cf. J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus.

5 In all der menschlichen Motivierung des Christenstandes, die Paulus ausmacht, kommt doch immer wieder zum Ausdruck, daß menschliches aufsteigt nicht ist, was der durch als Grundlage erweist, was er tut, und wenn er die rechte Mitte, sondern was Gott will und was Gott vor allem für der Menschen getan hat....dass Triebende liegt immer ihm, in Tun Gottes. Op. cit. S. 15.

This thesis stands in great debt to the point of view presented by the published works of Adolph Deissmann.[1]

Other German investigators

Deissmann's studies in the mysticism of Paul stimulated interest among a number of younger Germans, many of whom were influenced directly by him. Among recent German works on this subject are those of Kurt Deissner,[2] Wilhelm Mundle,[3] Traugott Schmidt,[4] Otto Schmitz,[5] Ernst Sommerlath,[6] Emil Weber,[7] and Wilhelm Weber.[8] Of these, the most significant are those of Sommerlath and W. Weber. We shall note briefly the contribution made by each.

---

1 Stimulation and encouragement to the study of Paul's mysticism were given the writer in a series of personal conferences with Dr. Deissmann in Berlin during the winter of 1926-1927.

2 K. Deissner, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit, 2. Aufl., Leipzig: Deichert, 1921.

3 W. Mundle, Das Religiöse Leben des Apostels Paulus, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.

4 T. Schmidt, Der Leib Christi, Leipzig: Deichert, 1919.

5 O. Schmitz, Die Christus-Gemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Genitivs Gebrauch, Gütersloh: Bertelman, 1924.

6 E. Sommerlath, Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus, Leipzig: Dörffling und Franke, 1923.

7 E. Weber, "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu' und die paulinische Christus-Mystik," Neuekirchliche Zeitschrift, XXXI, Heft 5.

8 W. Weber, Christus Mystik, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.

This thesis stands in great debt to the point of view presented by the published works of Adolph Deissmann.[1]

Other German investigators — Deissmann's studies in the mystical religions of Paul stimulated interest among a number of younger Germans, many of whom were influenced directly by him. Among recent German works on this subject are those of Kurt Deissner,[2] Wilhelm Bousset,[3] Traugott Schmidt,[4] Otto Schmitz,[5] Ernst Sommerlath,[6] Emil Weber,[7] and Wilhelm Weber.[8] Of these, the most significant are those of Sommerlath and W. Weber. We shall note briefly the contribution made by each.

---

1 Stimulation and encouragement to the study of Paul's mysticism were given the writer in a series of personal conferences with Dr. Deissmann in Berlin during the winter of 1926-1927.

2 K. Deissner, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit, 2. Aufl., Leipzig: Deichert, 1921.

3 W. Bousset, Die Religion Jesus und Apostels Paulus, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.

4 T. Schmidt, Der Leib Christi, Leipzig: Deichert, 1919.

5 O. Schmitz, Die Christus-Gemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Leidens Mystik Gebrauch, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1924.

6 E. Sommerlath, Der Urgrund des neuen Lebens nach Paulus, Leipzig: Hinrichs und Franke, 1921.

7 E. Weber, "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu' und die paulinische Christus-Mystik," Zeitschrift für Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft, XXXI, Heft 3.

8 W. Weber, Christus Mystik, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.

Sommerlath makes to the mystical interpretation of Paul is his characterization of Paul's experience as personality-mysticism.

> Will man dieses Verhältnis zwischen dem Auferstandenen und der Gemeinde Mystik nennen, so handelt es sich jedenfalls um 'Persönlichkeitsmystik,' d.h. um ein Verhältnis zwischen Person und Person. Und mit 'Persönlichkeitsmystik' haben wir deshalb bei Paulus zu tun, weil diese Mystik 'Geschichtsmystik' ist. Paulus denkt immer nur an den in die Geschichte eingegangenen Christus, der auf Erden das Heilswerk durch Tod und Auferstehung vollbracht hat und nun zur Herrlichkeit erhoben ist.[1]

Sommerlath does not develop his theory of personality-mysticism, but our subsequent study of Paul will show to what a large extent our own thought is in harmony with this conception.

W. Weber Wilhelm Weber, vicar of the Lutherkirche in Mannheim, is admittedly influenced by Deissmann, and in general follows his line of interpretation. Weber's study, however, is projected from the standpoint of the psychology of religion. He gives to his book the sub-title, Eine religions-psychologische Darstellung der paulinischen Christusfrömmigkeit. His conclusions are rather spectacular. He holds that in the Damascus experience the personality of Paul suffered total eclipse in the personality of Christ.[2] From that point

---

1 Op. cit. S. 71.

2 Das Paulinische Ich ist bei Damaskus untergegangen in dem Christus Ich. Dieses wurde als das eigene Person-Ich erlebt. . . Wer dem Herr anhängt (I Kor 6:17) ist eins mit ihm und zwar Geist, eine Person. Nicht nur bildlich ist diese Tatsache zu verstanden, sondern wirklich. Op. cit., S. 57.

Sommerfeldt means to the mystical interpretation of Paul in his characterization of Paul's experiences as personality-mystical.

> Will man diesen Vorgänge zwischen den Unterscheidungen und der sonstigen mystischen nennen, so handelt es sich jedenfalls um 'Personlichkeitsmystik,' d.h. um eine Verbindung zwischen Person und Person. Und mit 'Personlichkeitsmystik' haben wir dasjenig bei Paulus zu tun, weil diese mystik 'persönlichkeitsfähig' ist. Paulus denkt immer nur an den in die persönliche eingegangenen Christus, der auf Grund des Heilswerk durch Tod und Auferstehung vollbracht hat und nun zur Herrlichkeit erhoben ist.[1]

Sommerfeldt does not develop his theory of personality-mysticism, but our subsequent study of Paul will show to what a large extent our own thought is in harmony with this conception.

W. Weber Wilhelm Weber, vicar of the Lutherkirche in Hannover, is admittedly influenced by Deissmann, and in general follows his line of interpretation. Weber's study, however, is projected from the standpoint of the sociology of religion. He gives to his book the sub-title, Eine religions-psychologische Untersuchung der paulinischen Christusgemeinschaft. His conclusions are rather speculative. He holds that in the Damascus experience the personality of Paul suffered total collapse in the personality of Christ.[2] From that point

---

1 Op. cit. S. 71.

2 Ein Zusammenbruch ist bei Damaskus untergegangen in dem Christus Ich. Dieses wurde ein das eigene Person-Ich erlöst. . . Wer dem Herr entlaufen (I Kor 6:17) ist eins mit ihm und aber Geist, eine Person. Nicht nur Einigung ist diese Tatsache zu verstehen, sondern Verlöschen. Op. cit., S. 67.

forward Paul never really experiences with his own individuality, but with that of Christ. He can never tell whether it is he or Christ who experiences.[1] His very life, his personality, is Christ.[2] Just how all this takes place psychologically, Weber does not explain. He is content to declare it to be a fact, without resolving the difficulties which it raises for any normal mind. In his treatment of the ethical element in Paul he allows for the free and voluntary action of the human will,[3] though we might have supposed that on the basis of his earlier conclusions the moral acts of Paul are performed automatically. In his interpretation of faith and the indwelling Christ Weber makes some helpful suggestions. He holds that "Christus-Einwohnung" brought "sittliche Energie" into the life of Paul, and that

> Der Glaube ist die Verbindung der Gläubigen mit Christus.[4]

We conclude that although Weber claims to be approaching Paul's experience from the psychological viewpoint, he does it uncritically, and really fails to illuminate the mysticism of

---

1 Ob Gott erlebt? ob das menschliche Ich erlebt? - beide fliesst hier zusammen . . Ibid, S. 52.

2 Sein Leben, seine neue Persönlichkeit heisst jetzt Christus. Der Mensch ist im Wesen selber Christus. Ibid, S. 57.

3 Op. cit., S. 86. 4 Ibid, S. 82-83.

forward Faust never really experiences with his own individuality, but with that of Christ. He can never tell whether it is he or Christ who experiences.[1] His very life, his personality, is Christ.[2] Just how all this takes place psychologically, Weber does not explain. He is content to declare it to be a fact, without resolving the difficulties which it raises for any normal mind. In his treatment of the ethical element in Faust he allows for the free and voluntary action of the human will,[3] though we might have supposed that on the basis of his earlier conclusions the moral acts of Faust are performed automatically. In his interpretation of Faith and the Inspiring Christ Weber makes some helpful suggestions. He holds that "Christus-Einwohnung" brought "elliptic energies" into the life of Faust, and that

> Der Glaube ist die Verbindung der Gläubigen mit Christus.[4]

To conclude that although Weber claims to be appreciating Faust's experience from the psychological viewpoint, he does it uncritically, and really fails to illuminate the mysticism of

---

1 Ob Gott erlebt ob das menschliche Ich erlebt - beide fliesst hier zusammen . . Ibid. S. 82.

2 Sein Leben, seine neue Persönlichkeit heisst jetzt Christus. Der Mensch ist im Neuen wieder Christus, Ibid. S. 87.

3 Op. cit., S. 86. 4 Ibid. S. 85-86.

Paul by the use of psychological method. That he makes some interesting contributions to the religious interpretation of Paul's mysticism must be granted.

This brief review indicates something of the character of the work done by the men mentioned above. It is fair to say that none of them has added substantially to, nor changed radically the interpretation of Deissmann. For the most part their writings represent efforts to run down some particular phase of Paul's mysticism. Few original contributions have been made thereby.

Weinel There are two other German writers who have said significant things about the mysticism of Paul. The first is H. Weinel, former Professor of Theology at Jena, whose St. Paul, The Man and His Work, translated in 1906 by the Rev. G. A. Bienemann, is one of the most illuminating studies of the religious experience of Paul ever published. Weinel's contribution to the interpretation of Paul's experience as mysticism is indirect, rather than direct. He does not, like Deissmann, make the mysticism of Paul his main thesis. He does, however, develop the interpretation of the inner life of Paul, and the fellowship of the early Christian communities in such a way as to show the paramount significance of the first-hand, immediate experience of Christ which Paul and other believers enjoyed.

Paul by the use of psychological method. That he makes some interesting contributions to the religious interpretation of Paul's mysticism must be granted.

This brief review indicates something of the character of the work done by the men mentioned above. It is fair to say that none of them has added substantially to, nor changed radically the interpretation of Deissmann. For the most part their writings represent efforts to run down some particular phase of Paul's mysticism. Few original contributions have been made thereby.

Weinel There are two other German writers who have said significant things about the mysticism of Paul. The first is H. Weinel, former Professor of Theology at Jena, whose St. Paul, The Man and His Work, translated in 1906 by the Rev. G. A. Simonson, is one of the most illuminating studies of the religious experience of Paul ever published. Weinel's contribution to the interpretation of Paul's experience as mysticism is indirect, rather than direct. He does not, like Deissmann, make the mysticism of Paul his main thesis. He does, however, develop the interpretation of the inner life of Paul, and the Fellowship of the early Christian community in such a way as to show the permanent significance of the first-hand, immediate experience of Christ which Paul and other believers enjoyed.

In one or two passages,[1] he expressly states that Paul was a mystic, but he is concerned in these passages to protect Paul from the charge of propagating a vague, abnormal, and innocuous type of mysticism. Few things are more helpful to the student of Paul's mysticism than Weinel's fine characterization of the new fellowship.[2] He, perhaps even more than Deissmann, has brought out the significance of the social formulation of Paul's mysticism, and its ethical implications.

Schweitzer The second of the remaining German writers who have conducted an inquiry into the mysticism of Paul is Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer's name is linked with the twentieth century interpretation of the New Testament from the eschatological point of view. In systematic fashion this remarkable scholar, teacher, missionary, physician, musician, and writer has pursued through a quarter of a century a series of studies on gospel and Pauline criticism, Jesus, the Kingdom, and Pauline mysticism.[3]

---

1 Op. cit., pp. 140-150. 2 Ibid, pp. 130-133.

3 Von Reimarus zu Wrede, 1906; zw. Aufl.: Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung, 1913; English tr., The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910, by W. Montgomery.

Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung, 1911; English tr., Paul and His Interpreters, 1912, by W. Montgomery.

Das Messianitäts - und Leidens-geheimnis, 1901; zw. Aufl., 1929; English tr., The Mystery of the Kingdom of God.

Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus, 1929; English tr., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, by W. Montgomery, with prefatory note by F. C. Burkitt. N Y : Holt, 1931.

In one or two passages,[1] he expressly states that Faust was a mystic, but he is concerned in these passages to protect Faust from the charge of propagating a vague, abstruse, and innocuous type of mysticism. Few things are more helpful to the student of Faust's mysticism than Wolzogen's fine characterization of the new Gallowsvile.[2] He, perhaps even more than Delsemme, has brought out the significance of the social formulation of Faust's mysticism, and its ethical implications.

Schweitzer The second of the remaining German writers who have conducted an inquiry into the mysticism of Faust is Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer's name is linked with the twentieth century interpretation of the New Testament from the eschatological point of view. In systematic fashion this remarkable scholar, teacher, missionary, idealist, musician, and writer has pursued through a quarter of a century a series of studies on Gospel and Pauline criticism, Jesus, the Kingdom, and Pauline mysticism.[3]

---

1 Op. cit., pp. 140-150. 2 Ibid. pp. 150-153.

3 Von Reimarus zu Wrede, 1906; rev. impl.: Geschichte der Leben Jesu Forschung, 1913; English tr., The Quest of the Historical Jesus, 1910, by W. Montgomery.

Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung, 1911; English tr., Paul and His Interpreters, 1912, by W. Montgomery.

Das Messianitäts - und Leidens-Geheimnis, 1901; rev. impl., 1929; English tr., The Mystery of the Kingdom of God.

Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus, 1929; English tr., The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, by W. Montgomery, with introductory note by F. C. Burkitt. N Y : Holt, 1931.

His last work, begun in 1911, but interrupted by his busy days at Lambarene, was completed in 1929, and may be said to bring to a close a monumental labor on the eschatological influence on New Testament religion.

Schweitzer's Paul is both mystic and thinker. Though he makes the mystical element central in Paul, one gains the conviction through a reading of his work that he is less concerned to interpret the character of Paul's mystical experience than to demonstrate by rigid, inexorable logic Paul's complete capitulation to late-Jewish eschatology. Schweitzer is a man with a pattern; there is no detail of Pauline experience which he cannot fit into that pattern. With amazing confidence he takes some of the most difficult conceptions of Paul and thrusts them into his system. That the pattern so created is a distorted, unintelligible type of mysticism, utterly foreign to any other type, does not seem to be apparent to Schweitzer. For the dogmatic Paulinism of the nineteenth century Schweitzer substitutes an eschatological Paulinism, in which the mystical element is rationalized, systematized, and de-humanized in much the same fashion that nineteenth century Paulinists handled the speculative element. In Schweitzer Paul becomes a systematic mystico-eschatologist.

We may state briefly Schweitzer's approach to Paul's mysticism. Paul's dependence upon late-Jewish eschatology

His last work, begun in 1911, but interrupted by his busy days at Lambaréne, was completed in 1929, and may be said to bring to a close a monumental labor on the eschatological influences on New Testament religion.

Schweitzer's Paul is both mystic and thinker. Though he makes the mystical element central in Paul, one gains the conviction through a reading of his work that he is less concerned to interpret the character of Paul's mystical experiences than to demonstrate by rigid, inexorable logic Paul's complete capitulation to late-Jewish eschatology. Schweitzer is a man with a pattern; there is no depth of Pauline experience which he cannot fit into that pattern. With amazing confidence he takes some of the most difficult conceptions of Paul and thrusts them into his system. That the pattern so created is a distorted, unidentifiable type of mysticism, utterly foreign to any other type, does not seem to be apparent to Schweitzer. For the dogmatic Pauline of the nineteenth century Schweitzer substitutes an eschatological Pauline, in which the mystical element is rationalized, systematized, and de-humanized in much the same fashion that nineteenth century Pauline's humbled the speculative element. In Schweitzer Paul becomes a systematic mystico-eschatologist.

We may state briefly Schweitzer's approach to Paul's mysticism. Paul's dependence upon late-Jewish eschatology

for his world view is the key to his mysticism. In that particular brand of eschatology the elect man shares the fate of the world. Since the world has not yet returned to God, the elect man cannot be in God. Hence Paul's mysticism cannot be God-mysticism. How then does it become Christ-mysticism? Since Paul thought that Sonship to God could only come in the period of the Messianic Kingdom, Christ-mysticism is the bridge between the present world and the Messianic world. And Christ-mysticism is for Paul made possible by the cosmic events, the death and resurrection of Jesus. The dying and rising again of Christ are cosmic events because through them

> Jesus Christ has made an end of the natural world, and is bringing in the Messianic Kingdom.[1]

This is the foundation of Paul's eschatological theory of redemption.

Now appears an important phase of Schweitzer's argument. Granted the eschatological nature of Paul's doctrine of redemption, it is only natural to expect that the problems of eschatology would force Paul to a position that redemption is working itself out in the present. Through the death and resurrection of Jesus Paul conceives the Messianic Age already

---

1 The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 54.

for his world view is the key to his mysticism. In that particular brand of eschatology the elect man shares the fate of the world. Since the world has not yet returned to God, the elect man cannot be in God. Hence Ewald's mysticism cannot be God-mysticism. How then does it become Christ-mysticism? Since Ewald thought that Sonship to God could only come in the period of the Messianic Kingdom, Christ-mysticism is the bridge between the present world and the Messianic world. And Christ-mysticism is for Paul made possible by the cosmic events, the death and resurrection of Jesus. The dying and rising again of Christ are cosmic events because through them

> Jesus Christ has made an end of the natural world, and is bringing in the Messianic Kingdom.[1]

This is the foundation of Paul's eschatological theory of redemption.

How supports an important phase of Schweitzer's argument. Granted the eschatological nature of Paul's doctrine of redemption, it is only natural to ar ue that the problems of eschatology would force Paul to a position that redemption is working itself out in the present. Through the death and resurrection of Jesus Paul conceives the Messianic Age already

---

1 The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 54.

to have dawned. The next logical step for Paul is to assume that all those who die and rise with Christ are living in this supernatural world. Thus Schweitzer sees Paul bridging the chasm between the temporal and the eternal by identifying the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom with the resurrection of Jesus. Those who live in the supernatural world possess a resurrection mode of existence, attained through dying and rising again with Christ.

So Paul teaches Christ-mysticism in the way appropriate to the time immediately following the death and resurrection of Jesus. He asserts the solidarity of the elect with Christ already to be working itself out in the period between Christ's resurrection and return. Only thereby would the union of the elect with him in the Messianic Kingdom be rendered possible.

At this point Schweitzer propounds one of his most peculiar doctrines.

> In accordance with this, the eschatological concept of the Community of the Elect (that is to say, the predestined solidarity of the Elect with one another and with the Messiah) takes on for Paul a quasi-physical character.[1]

Jesus' dying and rising mean that thereby death and

---

1 Op. cit., p. 110.

to have learned. The next logical step for Paul is to assume that all those who die and rise with Christ are living in this supernatural world. Thus Schweitzer does Paul bridging the chasm between the temporal and the eternal by identifying the beginning of the Messianic Kingdom with the resurrection of Jesus. Those who live in the supernatural world possess a resurrection mode of existence, attained through dying and rising again with Christ.

So Paul becomes Christ-mysticism in the way appropriate to the time immediately following the death and resurrection of Jesus. He asserts the solidarity of the elect with Christ already to be working itself out in the period between Christ's resurrection and return. Only thereby would the union of the elect with him in the Messianic Kingdom be rendered possible.

At this point Schweitzer propounds one of his most peculiar doctrines.

> In accordance with this, the eschatological concept of the community of the elect (that is to say, the predestined solidarity of the elect with one another and with the Messiah) takes on for Paul a quasi-physical character.[1]

Jesus' dying and rising mean that thereby death and

---

1 Op. cit., p. 110.

resurrection

> have been set afoot throughout the whole corporeity of the Elect in the Messianic Kingdom.[1]

The elect thus become beings in whom dying and rising again have already begun; they are

> in reality no longer natural men, but, like Christ Himself, are already supernatural beings, only that in them this is not yet manifest.[2]

This body, or corporeity, constitutes the mystical body of Christ.

The sacraments are indispensable to Schweitzer's theory. Through baptism men are "grafted into Christ," i.e., into the quasi-physical, mystical body of Christ. This, Schweitzer assures us, is not to be conceived figuratively, but literally. The believers and Christ form a "joint personality."[3]

What of the ethical element in Paul? Here Schweitzer is more intelligible than elsewhere, though he injects a puzzling element by declaring that although Paul possesses a conception of redemption from which ethics directly results as a natural function of the redeemed state, this relationship of ethics to being-in-Christ is not to be understood metaphorically, but quasi-physically.[4]

---

1 Ibid. 2 Ibid. 3 Ibid, p. 118. 4 Ibid, p. 295.

resurrection

> have been cast afoot throughout the whole corporeity of the flesh in the Messianic Kingdom.[1]

The elect thus become beings in whom dying and rising again have already begun; they are

> in reality no longer natural men, but, like Christ Himself, are already supernatural beings, only that in them this is not yet manifest.[2]

This body, or corporeity, constitutes the mystical body of Christ.

The sacraments are indispensable to Schweitzer's theory. Through baptism men are "grafted into Christ," i.e., into the quasi-physical, mystical body of Christ. This, Schweitzer asserts us, is not to be conceived figuratively, but literally. The believers and Christ form a "joint personality."[3]

What of the ethical element in Paul? Here Schweitzer is more intelligible than elsewhere, though he injects a puzzling element by declaring that although Paul possesses a conception of redemption from which ethics directly results as a natural function of the redeemed state, this relationship of ethics to being-in-Christ is not to be understood mechanistically, but quasi-physically.[4]

---

1 Ibid. 2 Ibid. 3 Ibid. p. 110. 4 Ibid. p. 298.

But his position that ethics for Paul is not a matter of repentance, as with Jesus, but of fruits of the Spirit, seems sound. Paul's ethic presupposes not the natural man but the new creature who has come into existence in the dying and rising again with Christ. Schweitzer solves the problem of free-will by saying,

> The believer, by his will, should progressively make into a reality his death to the flesh and sin.....He will show by his ethical conduct how far dying and rising again with Christ has proceeded in him.[1]

This constitutes an exceedingly sketchy outline of a highly complicated system of interpretation. How shall we appraise Schweitzer's work?

Certainly all that can be of value in the eschatological method of approach seems to have been utilized by Schweitzer. With two of his general conclusions we are in agreement: 1) Paul is a mystic; 2) Paul's mysticism is Christ-mysticism, though even here we cannot agree that for Paul Christ-mysticism was in no sense God-mysticism. But with almost all of Schweitzer's other conclusions we are in open disagreement. This may be due to a complete misunderstanding of Schweitzer's thought. To us, many of Schweitzer's conclusions are deeper problems; many of his solutions are enigmas.

---

1 Op. cit., p. 301.

But his position that ethics for Paul is not a matter of repentance, as with Jesus, but of fruits of the Spirit, seems sound. Paul's ethic presupposes not the natural man but the new creature who has come into existence in the dying and rising again with Christ. Schweitzer solves the problem of free-will by saying,

> The believer, by his will, should progressively make into a reality his death to the flesh and sin....He will show by his ethical conduct how far dying and rising again with Christ has proceeded in him.[1]

This constitutes an exceedingly sketchy outline of a highly complicated system of interpretation. Now shall we appraise Schweitzer's work?

Certainly all that can be of value in the eschatological method of approach seems to have been utilized by Schweitzer. With two of his general conclusions we are in agreement: 1) Paul is a mystic; 2) Paul's mysticism is Christ-mysticism, though even here we cannot agree that for Paul Christ-mysticism was in no sense God-mysticism. But with almost all of Schweitzer's other conclusions we are in deep disagreement. This may be due to a complete misunderstanding of Schweitzer's thought. To us, many of Schweitzer's conclusions are deeper problems; many of his solutions are unknown.

---

1 Op. cit., p. 307.

First of all, we observe that Schweitzer adopts the eschatological point of view in his treatment of Paul's mysticism a priori. Without weighing the various hereditary elements and environmental factors which influenced Paul, Schweitzer lays down the basic assumption that Paul was completely dominated by eschatology. This assumption we challange. We find in Paul other more significant and influential factors than eschatology. Among them we would name his Damascus experience, and his work among the Gentiles. These factors, one working from within and the other from without, were more determinative for his religious experience than his world-view.

Second, we fail to see how mysticism is illuminated by recourse to eschatology. There is in Schweitzer no fine appreciation of the mystical element in Paul as such; no appraisal of the experience of personal relationship with Christ, or with others who like himself were in Christ. Eschatological categories do not apply to mystical experience. They confuse, rather than clarify, our understanding of Paul's mysticism. Schweitzer's method is wholly objective; there is in his book no sympathetic, imaginative, or psychological feeling for Paul's mysticism. Most of his points are established logically, by the method of technical argument. If he can establish a point objectively, it apparently matters little how inexplicable the position may become when considered subjectively. Hence such terms as "joint personality," "quasi-physical corporeity,"

First of all, we observe that Schweitzer adopts the soteriological point of view in his treatment of Paul's mysticism a priori. Without weighing the various hereditary elements and environmental factors which influenced Paul, Schweitzer lays down the basic assumption that Paul was completely dominated by soteriology. This assumption we challenge. We find in Paul other more significant and influential factors than soteriology. Among them we would name his Damascus experience, and his work among the Gentiles. These factors, one working from within and the other from without, were determinative for his religious experience than his world-view.

Second, we fail to see how mysticism is illuminated by recourse to soteriology. There is in Schweitzer no fine appreciation of the mystical element in Paul as such; no appraisal of the experience of personal relationship with Christ, or with others who like himself were in Christ. Soteriological categories do not apply to mystical experience. They confuse, rather than clarify, our understanding of Paul's mysticism. Schweitzer's method is wholly objective; there is in his book no sympathetic, imaginative, or psychological feeling for Paul's mysticism. Most of his points are established logically, by the method of technical argument. If he can establish a point objectively, it apparently matters little how inexplicable the position may become when considered subjectively. Hence such terms as "joint personality," "quasi-physical corporeity,"

"grafting," "dying and rising again," "the predestined solidarity of the Elect," are used absolutely; Schweitzer never offers to explain what he means or what Paul could have meant by them.

Third, Schweitzer's position that Paul was not influenced by the moral character of the historical Jesus is unsatisfactory. In Schweitzer's view, the mystical dying and rising again with Christ is wholly divorced from the Jesus of the flesh; only the new state of existence counts in the life of the believer. Our position is that however Paul's mysticism is to be interpreted, one fact is clear: Paul's Christ is the Jesus of history, and in Christ all the moral values of Jesus are retained.

Our final objection to Schweitzer's interpretation is that Paul's mysticism involved elements which are impervious to the possible influence of eschatology. Take the cardinal mystico-ethical teaching of Paul, - love. The application of eschatology to love, placing it in the time interval of the Messianic Age, can neither add to nor detract from love. Love for Paul is good, love is imperative, love is of God and of Christ, love is the bond of fellowship whether the Messianic Age has begun, or whether there never existed such a conception as the Messianic Age. Love is an aspect not of eschato-

"rattling," "dying and rising again," "the predestined nolitarity of the Elect," are meant absolutely; Sohweitzer never offers to explain what he means or what Paul could have meant by them.

Third, Schweitzer's position that Paul was not influenced by the moral character of the historical Jesus is unsatisfactory. In Schweitzer's view, the mystical dying and rising again with Christ is wholly divorced from the Jesus of the flesh; only the new state of existence counts in the life of the believer. Our position is that however Paul's mysticism is to be interpreted, one fact is clear: Paul's Christ is the Jesus of history, and in Christ all the moral values of Jesus are retained.

Our final objection to Schweitzer's interpretation is that Paul's mysticism involves elements which are impervious to the possible influence of eschatology. Take the cardinal mystico-ethical teaching of Paul, - love. The modification of eschatology to love, placing it in the time interval of the Messianic Age, can neither aid to nor detract from love. Love for Paul is good, love is imperative, love is of God and of Christ, love is the bond of fellowship whether the Messianic Age has begun, or whether there never existed such a connection as the Messianic Age. Love is an aspect not of eschato-

logical mysticism, but of Christ-mysticism. It is significant that Schweitzer takes this position himself, tacitly if not explicitly, in the final statement of his chapter on "Mysticism and Ethics."

English and American studies of Paul's mysticism

English and American scholars have manifested no great interest in the mystical interpretation of Paul. This is, no doubt, due in part to the speedy translation into English of the works of Weinel, Deissmann, and Schweitzer, and in part to the traditional wariness of English and American thought toward mysticism.

Yet Matthew Arnold,[1] as far back as 1870, recognized the prominence of the mystical element in Paul, and related it to the ethical element. But he conceived Paul's mysticism in terms of its emotional power to compel moral conduct, rather than as a type of mystical experience standing in its own right. The late Baron von Hügel recognized[2] Paul as a mystic, but made no pretension to definitive study of his experience. The same may be said of Rufus Jones of Haverford.[3] Two English scholars, one of the last generation, and one of the present, have devoted some attention to Paul's mysticism. They are Percy Gardner,[4]

---

1 St. Paul and Protestantism, 1870.

2 The Mystical Element of Religion, 1908.

3 Studies in Mystical Religion, 1909.

4 The Religious Experience of St. Paul, 1911.

logical mysticism, but of Christ-mysticism. It is significant that Schweitzer takes this position himself, tactfully if not explicitly, in the final statement of his chapter on "Mysticism and Ethics."

English and American scholars have manifested no great interest in the mystical interpretation of Paul's mysticism. This is, no doubt, due in part to the speedy translation into English of the works of Weiss, Deissmann, and Schweitzer, and in part to the traditional reticence of English and American thought toward mysticism.

Yet Matthew Arnold,[1] as far back as 1870, recognized the prominence of the mystical element in Paul, and related it to the ethical element. But he conceived Paul's mysticism in terms of its emotional power to control moral conduct, rather than as a type of mystical experience standing in its own right. The late Baron von Hügel recognized[2] Paul as a mystic, but made no extension to definitive study of his experience. The same may be said of Rufus Jones of Haverford.[3] Two English scholars, one of the last generation, and one of the present, have devoted some attention to Paul's mysticism. They are Percy Gardner.[4]

---

1 St. Paul and Protestantism, 1870.

2 The Mystical Element of Religion, 1908.

3 Studies in Mystical Religion, 1909.

4 The Religious Experience of St. Paul, 1911.

whose appreciation of the inner nature of Paul's religious experience approaches the quality of Weinel's, and C. A. A. Scott,[1] whose treatment of Paul's conception of fellowship is especially helpful. Scott reflects in his latest work the growing acceptance among English scholars of the mysticism of Paul by calling "The Mystical Factor of Salvation" one of the living issues in the New Testament.[2] In his chapter under this title Scott follows the lead of Deissmann, and makes some interesting contributions to the meaning of Paul's mysticism.

American scholarship has been slow to accept the mystical interpretation of Paul, though the article by H. J. Cadbury noted above indicates its growing importance for Pauline students. W. J. Lowstuter of Boston has for years interpreted Paul as a practical mystic. The point of view of his monograph on Paul[3] has been amplified and extended in his oral teaching. The chief impetus to the prosecution of this thesis was given by his teaching and personal counsel.

A thoroughgoing study of the experience of Paul from the point of view of psychology has recently been published by Arthur

---

1 Christianity According to St. Paul, 1927.

2 Living Issues in the New Testament, 1933.

3 Paul, Campaigner for Christ, 1915.

whose appreciations of the inner nature of Paul's religious experience emphasize the quality of Wolzel's, and C. A. Scott,[1] whose treatment of Paul's conception of fellowship is essentially helpful. Scott reflects in his latest work the growing acceptance among English scholars of the mysticism of Paul by calling "the mystical factor of salvation" one of the living issues in the New Testament.[2] In his chapter under this title Scott follows the lead of Deissmann, and makes some interesting contributions to the meaning of Paul's mysticism.

American scholarship has been slow to accept the mystical interpretation of Paul, though the article by H. J. Cadbury noted above indicates its growing importance for reading students. W. J. Lowstuter of Boston has for years interpreted Paul as a mystical mystic. The point of view of his monograph on Paul[3] has been amplified and extended in his oral teaching. The social impetus to the prosecution of this thesis was given by his teaching and personal counsel.

A thoroughgoing study of the experience of Paul from the point of view of psychology has recently been published by Arthur

---

1 Christianity According to St. Paul, 1927.

2 Living Issues in the New Testament, 1925.

3 Paul, Seek Mystery for Christ, 1913.

Holmes of the University of Pennsylvania.[1] Holmes examines the evidence for what might be called the psychic health of Paul, and shows the formative influence of his spiritual experience on his life and teaching.

(B) On the Ethical Element in Paul

Surprisingly little attention has been paid the ethics of Paul. In spite of the large place which ethical teaching assumes in Paul's letters, scholarship has in the main neglected it, preferring to cope with problems of Pauline doctrine.

German Investigators

In the German, Ernesti's work[2] was the outstanding study during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It cannot be reckoned evaluating or discriminating, however. Von Soden published an article in the early nineties on Paul's ethics,[3] but it was not until the turn of the century that any comprehensive study was made available. Juncker's two-volume work,[4] begun in 1904 and completed in 1919, measures up to such a standard. Johannes Weiss has a

---

1 The Mind of St. Paul, A Psychological Study, 1929.

2 Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus, (latest edition, 1880).

3 "Die Ethik des Paulus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1892, S. 109-146.

4 Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus, I, 1904; II, 1919.

Holmes of the University of Pennsylvania.[1] Holmes examines the evidence for what might be called the psychic health of Paul, and shows the formative influence of his religious experience on his life and teaching.

(3)
On the Ethical Element in Paul

Surprisingly little attention has been paid the ethics of Paul. In spite of the large place which ethical teaching assumes in Paul's letters, scholarship has in the main neglected it, preferring to cope with problems of Pauline doctrine.

German Investigators

In the German, Brunstäd's work[2] was the outstanding study during the latter half of the nineteenth century. It cannot be recommend evaluating or discriminating, however. Von Soden published an article in the early nineties on Paul's ethics,[3] but it was not until the turn of the century that any comprehensive study was made available. Lundeer's two-volume work,[4] begun in 1904 and completed in 1919, measures up to such a standard. Johannes Weiss has a

---

1 The Mind of St. Paul, A Psychological Study, 1928.

2 Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus, (Leipzig edition, 1880).

3 "Die Ethik des Paulus," Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche, 1897, s. 105-146.

4 Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus, I, 1904; II, 1919.

significant section on Paul's ethics in his great posthumous work,[1] and his commentary on I Corinthians is highly valuable.[2] R. Bultmann contributed a brief study of the problem of Paul's ethics in 1924.[3] Studies on Paul and Jesus by P. Feine,[4] A. Jülicher,[5] J. Weiss,[6] and A. Deissmann,[7] treat the ethical element in Paul. As we have seen, the works of Weinel and Schweitzer also deal in limited fashion with the ethics of Paul.

English and American Investigators

Of the works published in English on the ethics of Paul only three are inclusive enough to merit mention. They are the studies of A. B. D. Alexander,[8] which is homiletical in style, and very detailed in treatment; W. Martin,[9] which is little more than

---

1 Das Urchristentum, Zw. Teil, 1917.

2 "Der erster Korintherbrief," Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 1892.

3 "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Zeitschrift für Neues Testamentliche Wissenschaft, 1924, XXVII, 1 und 2.

4 Jesus Christus und Paulus, 1902.

5 Paulus und Jesus, 1907.

6 Paulus und Jesus, 1909.

7 The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, 1923.

8 The Ethics of St. Paul, 1910.

9 St. Paul's Ethical Teaching, 1917.

significant section on Fani's ethics in his great posthumous work,[1] and his commentary on I Corinthians is highly valuable.[2] E. Buttmann contributed a brief study of the problem of Fani's ethics in 1924.[3] Studies on Fani and Jesus by P. Soins,[4] A. Miliaher,[5] J. Weiss,[6] and A. Deissmann,[7] treat the ethical element in Fani. As we have seen, the works of Weinel and Dobschütz also deal in limited fashion with the ethics of Fani.

English and American Investigators	Of the works published in English on the ethics of Fani only three are inclusive enough to merit mention. They are the studies of A. E. J. Rawlinson,[8] which is homiletical in style, and very detailed in treatment; W. Martin,[9] which is little more than

---

1 The Urchristentum, Zu. Teil, 1917.

2 "Der erste Korinthbrief," Kritisch Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament, 1892.

3 "Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," Zeitschrift für Neue Testamentliche Wissenschaft, 1924, XXVII, 1 und 2.

4 Jesus Christus und Paulus, 1902.

5 Paulus und Jesus, 1907.

6 Paulus und Jesus, 1909.

7 The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, 1923.

8 The Ethics of St. Paul, 1910.

9 St. Paul's Ethical Teaching, 1917.

a restatement of what Paul said; and M. S. Enslin.[1] Of the three, Enslin's work is the most scholarly and illuminating, and deserves review here.

Enslin on Paul's Ethics

Enslin received his training under Moore, Ropes, and Lake, of Harvard, and exhibits their point of view, especially in his treatment of Paul the Jew. Enslin holds that modern scholarship has over-emphasized Paul's opposition to the law, and has failed to recognize the fact that he never escaped the influence of his Jewish heritage. He sees in the ethics of Paul the strong strain of Jewish teaching.

One of the most interesting inquiries conducted by Enslin is that in which he examines the relation of Paul's ethics to Stoicism and the Mystery Religions. The significance of this inquiry lies in the negative results obtained. After making a careful comparitive study of the ethics of Paul and the ethics of Stoicism, Enslin is forced to conclude that there is no dependence of the former on the latter. The only real influence of Stoicism on Paul that Enslin can find is in Paul's adoption of the diatribe as a form of literary expression. We regard these negative findings as significant because they rule out the theory that Paul's ethics is a composite body of borrowed material.

---

1 The Ethics of Paul, 1930.

In his brief survey of the ethical equipment of the Mystery cults Enslin finds

> that they were entirely unconcerned with what has come to be felt indissolubly linked to all true religion - morality..... The cults were unconcerned with moral standards; they neither accepted nor rejected. If a person were already virtuous, the cult would probably not corrupt him; if he were not virtuous, it would not tend to make him so.[1]

So far as Paul's ethical dependence upon the Mysteries is concerned, Enslin believes,

> It can be safely said that Paul does not show the slightest resemblance to or dependence upon the mystery cults for moral exhortations - and from their unmoral nature we could only expect this. To some that fact might logically exclude all mention of them in a treatment of Paul's Ethics. But this discussion has seemed necessary, since Paul again and again phrased his ethical ideals and goals in terms precisely similar to the other mysteries.[2]

This absolute denial of ethical influence on Paul by the Mysteries is an extreme position. In the subsequent discussion of the sources of Paul's ethics we shall take the position that the possibility of unconscious influence must be recognized.

Enslin gives great prominence to the Jewish element in Paul's Ethics. He concurs in Sabatier's statement:

---

1 Op. cit., pp. 54 - 55.

2 Ibid, p. 58.

In his brief survey of the ethical equipment of the

Mystery cults Smalin finds

> that they were entirely unconcerned with what has come to be felt indispensably ideal to all true religion - morality..... The cults were unconcerned with moral standards; they neither accepted nor rejected. If a person were already virtuous, the cult would probably not correct him; if he were not virtuous, it would not tend to make him so.[1]

So far as Kant's ethical dependence upon the Mysteries is

concerned, Smalin believes,

> It can be safely said that Kant does not show the slightest resemblance to or dependence upon the mystery cults for moral exhortations - and from their immoral nature we could only expect this. To some that fact might logically exclude all mention of them in a treatment of Kant's Ethics. But this dismissal has seemed necessary, since Kant again and again phrased his ethical ideals and goals in terms precisely similar to the other mysteries.[2]

This absolute denial of ethical influence on Kant by the Mysteries is an extreme position. In the subsequent discussion of the sources of Kant's ethics we shall take the position that the possibility of unconscious influence must be recognized.

Smalin gives great prominence to the Jewish element in Kant's Ethics. He concurs in Sabatier's statement:

---

1 Op. cit., pp. 54 - 55.

2 Ibid., p. 56.

> It is not the citizen of Tarsus but the Pharisee of Jerusalem . . . which explains the apostle to the Gentiles.[1]

The keynote of Enslin's position is sounded in his chapter on "The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul." Enslin holds the moral element to be linked directly to Paul's doctrine of salvation by faith. The Christian is impelled to a certain kind of life by virtue of his union with Christ. He must live a life worthy of fellowship with Christ. He must conform his life to his Lord's. He must cut himself free from all that would hinder or impede the development of that life.

Thus fellowship with Christ becomes the pivotal point in Enslin's theory of Paul's ethics.

> We might almost say that this sense of koinonia produced his ethics, or at least gave to it its distinctive form.[2]

Enslin's general point of view is summarized in this statement:

> Thus we see Paul had no formal system of ethics as such, no text-book for Christian conduct. . . Ethics and religion for him, as for any other Jew, could never be dissociated. The Christian ethic was the living in a manner worthy of the high calling to which the Christian had been called.

---

1 Sabatier, L' Apôtre Paul, 1881, p. 27, quoted by Enslin, op. cit., p. 16.

2 Op. cit., p. 78.

> It is not the citizen of Tarsus but the Jerusalem . . . which explains the apostle to the Gentiles.[1]

The keynote of Smith's position is sounded in his chapter on "The Central Place of Morality in the Life and Thought of Paul." Smith holds the moral element to be linked directly to Paul's doctrine of salvation by faith. The Christian is impelled to a certain kind of life by virtue of his union with Christ. He must live a life worthy of following with Christ. He must conform his life to his Lord's. He must cut himself free from all that would hinder or impede the development of that life.

This following with Christ becomes the pivotal point in Smith's theory of Paul's ethics.

> We might almost say that this sense of kinship produced his ethics, or at least gave to it its distinctive form.[2]

Smith's general point of view is summarized in this statement:

> Thus we see Paul had no formal system of ethics as such, no text-book for Christian conduct. . . . Ethics and religion for him, as for any other Jew, could never be dissociated. The Christian ethic was the living in a manner worthy of the high calling to which the Christian had been called.

---

1 Sabatier, L' Apôtre Paul, 1881, p. 27, quoted by Smith, op. cit., p. 16.

2 Op. cit., p. 76.

> It embraced the whole life and all the relationships of life.[1]

But there is inherent in Enslin's whole treatment of the ethics of Paul a contradiction. On the one hand he takes the position that his ethics was determined by his Jewish inheritance, and on the other that it was produced by his sense of fellowship with Christ. This contradiction Enslin never resolves. This thesis takes the position that no matter how much of his ethical code Paul may have carried with him from Judaism to Christianity, his ethic as a Christian was determined not by his Jewish inheritance but by his Christ-mysticism.

In addition to the three studies named above, a number of excellent chapters on Paul's ethics are to be found in English works. Two of these deserve mention; one, a chapter in Percy Gardner's The Religious Experience of St. Paul, and two, a chapter of Orello Cone's Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher (1898).

(C)
The Relation of Paul's Mysticism to his Ethics

On the precise problem of this thesis, the relation of the mystical to the ethical element in Paul, there is no published work of which we have knowledge. Certain chapters in the works named, particularly those of Enslin, Deissmann, Schweitzer, Weinel, and Gardner, suggest aspects of this relationship. But no

---

1 Ibid, pp. 76 - 77.

> It embraced the whole life and all the relationships of life.[1]

But there is inherent in Buslin's whole treatment of the ethics of Paul a contradiction. On the one hand he takes the position that his ethics was determined by his Jewish inheritance, and on the other that it was produced by his sense of fellowship with Christ. This contradiction Buslin never resolves. This thesis takes the position that no matter how much of his religious code Paul may have received with his from Judaism to Christianity, his ethic as a Christian was determined not by his Jewish inheritance but by his Christ-mysticism.

In addition to the three studies named above, a number of excellent chapters on Paul's ethics are to be found in English works. Two of these deserve mention; one, a chapter in Percy Gardner's <u>The Religious Experience of St. Paul</u>, and two, a chapter of Orello Cone's <u>Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher</u> (1898).

(C) The Relation of Paul's Mysticism to his Ethics	On the precise problem of this thesis, the relation of the mystical to the ethical element in Paul, there is no published work of which we have knowledge. Certain chapters in the works named, particularly those of Smelin, Dulmann, Schweitzer, Weinel, and Gardner, suggest aspects of this relationship. But no

---

1 <u>Ibid.</u> pp. 76 - 77.

writer of whom we have knowledge has addressed himself to the specific problem of discovering and characterizing this relationship. The way therefore appears to be open for a study of this relationship as a new problem, and to this study we now turn.

Chapter II

Mysticism and Religion

Mysticism and Religion

The relation of mysticism to religion is extremely difficult to define. For purposes of this immediate discussion, religion may be defined as

> the total attitude of man toward what he considers to be superhuman and worthy of worship, or devotion, or propitiation, or at least of reverence.[1]

By distinction, mysticism is one way of experiencing whatever man considers to be divine.

Now it is at once evident that not all religion is mystical in character. There are many ways of experiencing the values of religion, of which mysticism is but one. Thus the history of religions offers many examples of religious systems in which mysticism played little or no part. The highly practical religion of Confucianism, though possessing the chief characteristics of religion, was devoid of mysticism.[2] Certain types of individual and group mind do not respond to the inner appeal of mysticism. A. S. Pringle-Pattison says:

> For opposite reasons, neither the Greek nor the Jewish mind lent itself readily to mysticism: the Greek, because of its clear and sunny naturalism; the Jewish, because of its rigid monotheism and its

---

1 Brightman, Introduction to Philosophy, p. 318.

2 G. F. Moore, History of Religions, I, p. 20 - 47.

Mysticism and Religion

The relation of mysticism to religion is extremely difficult to define. For purposes of this immediate discussion, religion may be defined as

> the total attitude of man toward what he considers to be supremum and worthy of worship, or devotion, or propitiation, or at least of reverence.[1]

By distinction, mysticism is one way of experiencing whatever man considers to be divine.

Now it is at once evident that not all religion is mystical in character. There are many ways of experiencing the values of religion, of which mysticism is but one. Thus the history of religions offers many examples of religious systems in which mysticism played little or no part. The highly practical religion of Confucianism, though possessing the other characteristics of religion, was devoid of mysticism.[2] Certain types of individual and group mind do not response to the inner appeal of mysticism. A. E. Taylor-Pettigrew says:

> For opposite reasons, neither the Greek nor the Jewish mind lent itself readily to mysticism: the Greek, because of its clear and sunny naturalism; the Jewish, because of its rigid monotheism and its

---

1 Brightman, Introduction to Philosophy, p. 316.

2 G. F. Moore, History of Religions, I, p. 20 - 47.

> turn toward worldly realism and statutory observance. It is only with the exhaustion of Greek and Jewish civilization that Mysticism becomes a prominent factor in Western thought. It appears, therefore, contemporaneously with Christianity, and is a sign of the world-weariness and deep religious need that mark the decay of the old world.[1]

Thus it is quite possible to use the term religion without including mysticism.

Is it equally possible to use the term mysticism in the same exclusive sense? Has any type of mysticism ever existed in which religion played no part? Here the answer is more obscure. One might conceive of nature mysticism as non-religious in character, if it is defined, as in Rudolph Otto, as,

> the sense of being immersed in the oneness of nature, so that man feels all the

---

1 "Mysticism," Encyclopedia Brittanica, Vol. 19, p. 124.
Cf. also
Inge,
> Jewish mind and character in spite of its deeply religious bent was alien to mysticism....., Christian Mysticism, p. 39;

Angus,
> To the Greek mind in its hey day the mystic temperament was foreign. Environment of Early Christianity, p. 119.

> Nevertheless both Jewish and Greek religion developed strains of mysticism, the former in the Psalms and Prophets, the latter through Orphism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, and the Mystery Religions. Angus, op. cit., p. 119.

turn toward worldly realism and statutory observance. It is only with the exhaustion of Greek and Jewish civilization that mysticism becomes a prominent factor in western thought. It appears, therefore, contemporaneously with Christianity, and is a sign of the world-weariness and deep religious need that mark the decay of the old world.[1]

Thus it is quite possible to use the term religion without implying mysticism.

Is it equally possible to use the term mysticism in the more exclusive sense? Has any type of mysticism ever existed in which religion played no part? Here the answer is more obscure. One might conceive of nature mysticism as non-religious in character, if it is defined, as in Rudolph Otto, as,

> the sense of being immersed in the oneness of nature, so that man feels all the

---

1 "Mysticism" Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 19, p. 184. Cf. also Inge,

> Jewish mind and character in spite of its deeply religious bent was alien to mysticism.....Christian Mysticism, p. 39:

Inge,

> To the Greek mind in its day the mystic temperament was foreign. Development of Early Christianity, p. 112.

> Nevertheless both Jewish and Greek religion developed strains of mysticism, the former in the Essenes and Therapeutes, the latter through Orphism, Neo-Pythagoreanism, and the mystery religions. Inge, op. cit., p. 112.

> individuality, all the peculiarity of natural things in himself.[1]

But nature mysticism in the primitive stage revealed in the striking poem of Jelaleddin[2] is quite different from the nature mysticism of the mediaeval Francis, or of modern poets like Henry Vaughan, Wordsworth, and Tennyson. For both Francis and the moderns saw nature "shot through with intimations of God."[3] Nature mysticism is in them God-mysticism, Christian mysticism, - a way of experiencing the God who is immanent in nature.

Soul mysticism of the Indian Yoga type[4] can hardly be called religious, for in it the individual does not seek union with a power outside himself, but rather strives to develop what Otto calls the "numinous" sense of the soul.[5] Yet it is doubtful whether soul mysticism can be excluded from the general field of religion, for belief in the soul becomes a means of salvation, a way of relating self to a power that redeems or transforms self.[6]

---

1 Mysticism East and West, p. 74. 2 Ibid.

3 W.K. Fleming, Mysticism in Christianity, p. 200.

4 Otto, Mysticism East and West, pp. 142-143.

5 Otto, ibid, p. 143.

6 Otto, ibid, p. 143

The same is true of Buddhist mysticism.

> It has been seriously maintained that Buddhism is not religion at all because it denies God. This it certainly does, but it is nevertheless religion, for it lives in the numinous. The salvation wrought in Nirvana, like that sought in Yoga, is magical and numinous.. Nirvana ia an absolute, supranatural, mystic state to the same extent as is the unio mystica between the soul and the eternal God, and by virtue of that state both are forms of mysticism though with a very different content.[1]

Thus the search for a "mysticism without religion" among the great historic expressions of mysticism fails to yield any clear results. Though instances of "religion without mysticism" are not far to seek, mysticism can hardly be separated from religion. It usually appears to be connected with

> the endeavor of the human mind to grasp the divine essence or the ultimate reality of things, and to enjoy the blessedness of actual communion with the highest . . . .[2]

And though mysticism appears pantheistic rather than religious in its speculative utterances,

> mysticism differs from ordinary pantheism in that its inmost motive is religious. . .[3]

---

1 Ibid, pp. 142 - 143.

2 Pringle-Pattison, op. cit., p. 123. 3 Ibid.

The same is true of Buddhist mysticism.

> It has been recently maintained that Buddhism is not religion at all because it denies God. This is certainly true, but it is nevertheless religion, for it lives in the unknown. The motivation wrought in Nirvana, like that sought in Yoga, is magical and numinous. Nirvana is an absolute, supernatural, mystic state to the same extent as is the unio mystica between the soul and the eternal God, and by virtue of that state both are forms of mysticism though with a very different content.[1]

Thus the search for a "mysticism without religion" among the great historic expressions of mysticism fails to yield any clear results. Though instances of "religion without mysticism" are not far to seek, mysticism can hardly be separated from religion. It usually appears to be connected with

> the endeavor of the human mind to grasp the living essence of the ultimate reality of things, and to enjoy the blessedness of actual communion with the highest . . . .[2]

And though mysticism appears speculative rather than religious in its speculative utterances,

> mysticism differs from ordinary speculation in that its innermost motive is religious. . .[3]

---

1 Ibid., pp. 146 - 150.

2 Tringle-Rattison, op. cit., p. 125. 3 Ibid.

Yet the term mysticism is frequently used in common parlance without specific religious reference. One may properly speak of the mysticism of human friendship, or the mysticism which manifests itself in passionate devotion to one's state or race. Margaret Carey Madeira, writing in The Atlantic Monthly,[1] speaks of the power which welded the German people together as a nation before the Great War as

> the mystical belief in the superiority of the German people;

and of the Russian Communist as

> a man made new by faith in his cause and by the surrender of his will in order to serve it. Into the new faith he has poured the mysticism that formerly united him with God.[2]

There is a sense, therefore, in which mysticism may be used to designate the non-religious experience of rapport common to men who share in personal, political, or racial ventures.

But as the term is used in its historic, technical sense, reference to religion is usually either expressed or implied.[3] As used in this thesis mysticism carries the connotation of religious mysticism. Moreover, the chief concern

---

1 Vol. 153, No. 6, (June 1934) pp. 641 - 653.

2 Ibid, p. 651. 3 As in The Encyclopedia Brittanica, The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ad loc., and monographs on mysticism mentioned in Bibliography.

Yet the term mysticism is frequently used in common parlance without specific religious reference. One may properly speak of the mysticism of human friendship, or the mysticism which manifests itself in passionate devotion to one's state or race. Margaret Darcy Madore, writing in <u>The Atlantic Monthly</u>,[1] speaks of the power which welded the German people together as a nation before the Great War as

> the mystical belief in the superiority of the German people;

and of the Russian Communist as

> a man made new by faith in his cause and by the surrender of his will in order to serve it. Into the new faith he has poured the mysticism that formerly united him with God.[2]

There is a sense, therefore, in which mysticism may be used to designate the non-religious experience of rapport common to men who share in personal, political, or racial ventures.

But as the term is used in its historic, technical sense, reference to religion is usually either expressed or implied.[3] As used in this thesis mysticism carries the connotation of <u>religious mysticism</u>. Moreover, the chief concern

---

1 Vol. 153, No. 6, (June 1934) pp. 681 - 693.

2 <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 681.

3 As in <u>The Encyclopedia Brittanica</u>, <u>The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics</u>, and Ice., and numerous on mysticism mentioned in bibliography.

of this thesis is not with philosophical doctrines of union with the Absolute or the Other, but with mystical religious experience.[1]

The Elements of Religion

The attempt to define such inclusive terms as "religion" and "mysticism" is precarious business. It runs the grave risk of placing limitations upon living experience. Through hasty generalizations essential elements are often overlooked. The varieties of religious experience can hardly be comprehended under a single definition of religion; the reach of religion is too wide, both upward and outward; the roots of religion run too deep, both historically and psychologically. With characteristic frankness William James disavowed the attempt to define religion in its entirety.

> Religion cannot stand for any single principle or essence, but is rather a collective name. . . We may very likely find no one essence, but many characters which may alternately be equally important in religion.[2]

For purposes of this thesis it is important to discover the various "characters which may alternately be equally important in religion." We ask therefore, What are the essen-

---

1 R. M. Jones, "Mysticism, Introductory," Ency. of Rel. and Ethics, Vol. IX, pp. 82 - 83.

2 James, The Varieties of Religious experience, p. 26.

of this thesis is not with philosophical doctrines of union with the Absolute or the Other, but with mystical religious experiences.[1]

The Elements of Religion

The attempt to define such inclusive terms as "religion" and "mysticism" is precarious business. It runs the grave risk of placing limitations upon living experience. Through hasty generalizations essential elements are often overlooked. The variables of religious experience can hardly be comprehended under a single definition of religion; the reach of religion is too wide, both upward and outward; the roots of religion run too deep, both historically and psychologically. With characteristic frankness William James disavowed the attempt to define religion in its entirety.

> Religion cannot stand for any single principle or essence, but is rather a collective name. . . We may very likely find no one essence, but many characters which may alternately be equally important in religion.[2]

For purposes of this thesis it is important to discover the various "characters which may alternately be equally important in religion." We ask therefore, What are the essen-

---

1 R. M. Jones, "Mysticism, Introductory," Dict. of Rel. and Ethics, Vol. IX, pp. 92 - 98.

2 James, The Varieties of Religious experience, p. 29.

tial elements of religion?

Von Hügel The late Baron von Hügel, whose massive scholarship ranged the whole field of religion, and whose studies in mystical religion are regarded as authoritative, finds in the enormous complexity of religious experience three basic elements, appearing never in isolation, but in mutually modifying forms. Considered genetically, these elements correspond to the outlook and mode of apprehension characteristic of childhood, youth, and maturity.

Now the individual experiences religion first through sense, memory, and imagination. All the external, concrete, readily picturable phases of religion make their impression upon child consciousness. Thus the first element to assume any proportions in the religious life is the "External, Authoritative, Historical, Traditional, Institutional"[1] element. The world of religious symbolism, to which our senses first respond; the realm of church organization, with its impressive sacraments, ritual, and ceremonial, together with its history; the meaning and force of religious personalities of all ages; the rule of religious authority; the practical rules of conduct growing out of faith; the social, political, and economic principles which attach to the religious institution; the mass of tradition which

---

1 Von Hügel, The Mystical Element in Religion, Vol. I, p. 51.

tial elements of religion?

Von Hügel The late Baron von Hügel, whose massive scholarship ranged the whole field of religion, and whose studies in mystical religion are regarded as authoritative, finds in the enormous complexity of religious experience three basic elements, appearing never in isolation, but in mutually modifying forms. Considered genetically, these elements correspond to the outlook and mode of apprehension characteristic of childhood, youth, and maturity.

Now the individual experiences religion first through sense, memory, and imagination. All the external, concrete, readily picturable phases of religion make their impression upon child consciousness. Thus the first element to assume any proportions in the religious life is the "External, Authoritative, Historical, Traditional, Institutional"[1] element. The world of religious symbolism, to which our senses first respond; the realm of church organization, with its impressive sacraments, ritual, and ceremonial, together with its history; the meaning and force of religious personalities of all ages; the rule of religious authority; the practical rule of conduct growing out of faith; the social, political, and economic principles which attach to the religious institution; the mass of tradition which

---

1 Von Hügel, The Mystical Element in Religion, Vol. I, p. 84.

is grafted to each and all of these; this large group of manifestations, taken together, comprises the first great element of religion, the Institutional or Historical.

The second method by which the growing consciousness of the individual apprehends religion is by question and argument, the youth's mode of appeal. At this stage the data of sense, memory and imagination prove inadequate to the growing mind. His curiosity whetted, youth seeks through reflection, comparison, interrogation, and argument to interpret the raw material of perdeption in such a way as to give him a more intelligible conception of the real. In the field of religion this mode of appeal finds answer in the second great element: Thought, Philosophy, System, and Dogma. With reason as guide, the religious consciousness has produced in the course of human history the great speculative systems, the creeds and doctrines.

The third means of apprehension is characteristic of the mature man. At this stage sense and reason are transcended by intuition, feeling, and volition. Man's ethical and spiritual powers are developed through inner experiences of pleasure and pain, power and weakness. Religion of authority gives way to religion of the spirit. External acts are supplanted by interior reaches of faith. Reflection and

is prefixed to each and all of these; this large group of manifestations, taken together, constitutes the first great element of religion, the Institutional or Historical.

The second method by which the growing consciousness of the individual apprehends religion is by meditation and argument, the youth's mode of appeal. At this stage the data of sense, memory and imagination prove inadequate to the growing mind. His curiosity aroused, youth seeks through reflection, comparison, interrogation, and argument to interpret the raw material of perception in such a way as to give him a more intelligible conception of the real. In the field of religion this mode of appeal finds answer in the second great element: Thought, Philosophy, System, and Dogma. With reason as guide, the religious consciousness has produced in the course of human history the great speculative systems, the creeds and doctrines.

The third mode of apprehension is characteristic of the mature man. At this stage sense and reason are transcended by intuition, feeling, and volition. Man's ethical and spiritual powers are developed through inner experiences of pleasure and pain, power and weakness. Religion of authority gives way to religion of the spirit. External acts are supplanted by interior resolves of faith. Reflection and

belief yield to experiment and action. The third great element of religion both expresses and fulfills the religious aspiration of the mature man. This element may be called the Experimental, Mystical, or Volitional, - the directly operative element.

These three elements, then, according to Von Hügel, are discernible in religion: 1) the institutional or historical; 2) the dogmatic or philosophical; 3) the mystical or volitional.

Pratt's correction

James Bissett Pratt, in his The Religious Consciousness, concurs in the main with Von Hügel's division of religion into these three elements, but regards the third element as an over-simplification. He contends that two distinct elements are involved here: a)

> the mystical which appeals solely to a particular kind of experience and a kind that is peculiarly subjective,

and b)

> the practical or moral which lays the emphasis upon the thing that must be done rather than upon the thing that must be believed or felt. [1]

So that instead of finding three elements in religion, Pratt finds four: 1) the traditional, 2) the rational, 3) the mystical, 4) the moral.

---

1 Op. cit., p. 14.

belief yield to experiment and action. The third great element of religion both expresses and fulfills the religious aspiration of the mature man. This element may be called the Experimental, Mystical, or Ventitional, - the directly operative element.

These three elements, then, according to Von Hügel, are discernible in religion: 1) the institutional or historical; 2) the dogmatic or philosophical; 3) the mystical or ventitional.

Pratt's correction

James Bissett Pratt, in his The Religious Consciousness, concurs in the main with Von Hügel's division of religion into these three elements, but regards the third element as an over-simplification. He contends that two distinct elements are involved here: a)

> the mystical which appeals solely to a particular kind of experience and a kind that is essentially subjective.

and b)

> the practical or moral which lays the emphasis upon the thing that must be done rather than upon the thing that must be believed or felt. 1

So that instead of finding three elements in religion, Pratt finds four: 1) the traditional, 2) the rational, 3) the mystical, 4) the moral.

---

1 Op. cit., p. 14.

The problem of the relationship of mysticism to ethics is raised indirectly by this difference of opinion between Pratt and Von Hügel. Von Hügel holds that mysticism and volition represent one element in religion; Pratt regards volition as the root of a separate element, the ethical, and contends that it is not to be identified with the mystical element. Paul's religion offers a synthesis of these two conflicting points of view. Though distinguishable, mysticism and ethics are intimately related in his experience.

The interdependence of the four elements

Now these four elements seldom, if ever, appear in isolation in any one life or any one religion, and ought never so to appear. Even where one dominates, rudiments of the other three are generally to be found. Could we construct ever so strong a case for the unique, disparate character of each element, showing its absolutely indispensable qualities and values, we should nevertheless discover that each element is dependent upon and necessary to the remaining elements. Yet the mutual support and advantage which each yields to other is no greater than the hostility which each offers to other. Though belonging together, these elements challenge each other, producing a tension in the individual or group in which they find root. The religious life is a series of crises in which the historical, the philosophical, the mystical, and the moral elements

The problem of the relationship of mysticism to ethics is raised indirectly by this difference of opinion between Pratt and Von Hügel. Von Hügel holds that mysticism and religion represent one element in religion; Pratt regards religion as the root of a separate element, the ethical, and contends that it is not to be identified with the mystical element. Paul's religion offers a synthesis of these two conflicting points of view. Though distinguishable, mysticism and ethics are intimately related in his experience.

The interdependence of the four elements

Now these four elements religion, if ever, appear in isolation in any one life or any one religion, and ought never so to appear. Even where one dominates, rudiments of the other three are generally to be found. Could we construct ever so strong a case for the unique, disparate character of each element, showing its absolutely independent qualities and values, we should nevertheless discover that each element is dependent upon and necessary to the remaining elements. Yet the mutual support and advantage which each yields to other is no greater than the hostility which each offers to other. Though belonging together, these elements challenge each other, producing a tension in the individual or group in which they find root. The religious life is a series of crises in which the historical, the philosophical, the mystical, and the moral elements

are warring for supremacy. As the individual life is enamoured of one element it is repelled by another. Few lives have been able to hold all four elements in perfect balance.

Mysticism involves all elements of religion

The foregoing serves to support the position of this thesis that in mystical religion, though the mystical element is dominant, the historical, rational, and ethical elements are also present. At its best mysticism is an inclusive type of religious experience; it depends upon and benefits by the play and interaction of all four elements of religion.

What is mysticism?

The term mysticism is used in the widest sense to designate that type of experience in which man conceives himself to come into immediate contact with whatever he regards as divine. Christian mysticism is man's immediate experience of the God who is revealed in the life, character, and ministry of Jesus Christ.

Etymology

The word mysticism derives from the Greek verb μύω , meaning literally "to shut the mouth," "to close." It is found in the classical Greek of Suidas, Herodotus, Plato, Plutarch, and Aristophanes. It was first used in connection with the Greek mysteries, where the initiated were thought to be in possession of mysteries,

are warring for supremacy. In the individual life is swayed of one element it is repelled by another. Few lives have been able to hold all four elements in perfect balance.

Mysticism involves all elements of religion — The foregoing serves to support the position of this thesis that in mystical religion, though the mystical element is dominant, the historical, rational, and ethical elements are also present. At its best mysticism is an inclusive type of religious experience; it depends upon and benefits by the play and interaction of all four elements of religion.

What is mysticism? — The term mysticism is used in the widest sense to designate that type of experiences in which man conceives himself to come into immediate contact with whatever he regards as divine. Christian mysticism is man's immediate experience of the God who is revealed in the life, character, and ministry of Jesus Christ.

Etymology — The word mysticism derives from the Greek verb μύειν, meaning literally "to shut the mouth," "to close." It is found in the classical Greek of Euripides, Herodotus, Plato, Plutarch, and Aristophanes. It was first used in connection with the Greek mysteries, where the initiates were thought to be in possession of mysteries.

> . . secret rites and lessons . . . about which the mouth was to be closed. [1]

Words relating to mystery, initiation, et cetera, were later adopted into the ecclessiastical phraseology of the early Christian world, -

> not in the modified use of them occasionally observable in St. Paul, but with their old pagan significance. [2]

But a second meaning soon attached itself to the term:

> the practice of closing as completely as possible every avenue of perception by the senses, for the purpose of withdrawing the mind from everything external into itself, so as to fit it (raised above every sensuous representation) for receiving divine illumination immediately from above.[3]

This is the use to which the word is put by the Neoplatonists. Mysticism in this sense is the effort of man to strip off the material and sensuous, to close every perceptual faculty, in order that the truly spiritual element may come into oneness with the divine.

The first appearance of the term in the Christian Church is in the fifth century writings of Dionysius the Areopagite (Pseudo-Dionysius), who gave to his works the title

---

1 Vaughan, Hours With The Mystics, Vol. I, p. 15.

2 Ibid. 3 Ibid, p. 16.

> . . secret rites and lessons . .
> about which the mouth was to be
> closed. 1

Words relating to mystery, initiation, et cetera were later adopted into the ecclesiastical phraseology of the early Christian world. -

> not in the multiform use of them occasionally observable in St. Paul, but with their old pagan significance. 2

But a second meaning soon attached itself to the term:

> the practice of closing as completely as possible every channel of information by the senses, for the purpose of withdrawing the mind from everything external into itself, so as to fit it (raised above every sensuous representation) for receiving divine illumination immediately from above. 3

This is the use to which the word is put by the Neoplatonists. Mysticism in this sense is the effort of man to strip off the material and sensuous, to close every perceptual faculty, in order that the truly spiritual element may come into oneness with the divine.

The first appearance of the term in the Christian Church is in the fifth century writings of Dionysius the Areopagite (Pseudo-Dionysius), who gave to his works the title

---

1 Vaughan, Hours With the Mystics, Vol. 1, p. 18.

2 Ibid. 3 Ibid, p. 19.

"Mystical Theology." Here the mystic is not merely one who is initiated into the mysteries, but who, by mortifying the flesh, shutting out the data of sense, and ignoring the intellectual processes, attains in passivity a union with the divine, and in ignorance a wisdom transcending all knowledge. [1]

Mysticism in the Christian Church

But to gain a comprehensive understanding of the term "mysticism" it is necessary to move from the narrow field of etymology to the broad realm of church history. The great mystics of the Christian tradition have given to the term its proper meaning.

Plotinus, the great Neoplatonist (204-270), though technically not in the Christian tradition, is commonly recognized as the great fountain-head of Christian mysticism. He exercised a profound influence on the Latin Augustine (b. 354), and Dionysius the Areopagite.

The Mystical Theology of Dionysius became known in the western church in the ninth century through its translation into Latin by John the Scot (Scotus Erigena), and continued its influence in the mediaeval mystics. [2]

---

1 Vaughan, Op. cit., p. 17.

2 Underhill, The Mystics of the Church, p. 71.

"Mystical Theology." Here the mystic is not merely one who is initiated into the mysteries, but who, by mortifying the flesh, shutting out the data of sense, and ignoring the intellectual processes, attains in passivity a union with the divine, and in ignorance a wisdom transcending all knowledge.[1]

Mysticism in the Christian Church

But to gain a comprehensive understanding of the term "mysticism" it is necessary to move from the narrow field of etymology to the broad realm of church history. The great mystics of the Christian tradition have given to the term its proper meaning.

Plotinus, the great Neoplatonist (204-270), though technically not in the Christian tradition, is commonly recognized as the great formulain-head of Christian mysticism. He exercised a profound influence on the Latin Augustine (a. 354), and Dionysius the Areopagite.

The Mystical Theology of Dionysius became known in the western church in the ninth century through its translation into Latin by John the Scot (Scotus Erigena), and continued its influence in the mediaeval mystics.[2]

---

1 Vaughan, op. cit., I. 17.

2 Underhill, The Mystics of the Church, p. VI.

Following the close of the patristic period there are scant documentary indications of mystical religion until the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when a marked revival took place. Anselm (1033-1109), the great statesman and ecclesiastic, reveals a strong mystical interest. The twelfth century is rich in mystical religion. The German abbess Hildegarde (1098-1179), who influenced the thirteenth century German women, Mechthild of Madgeburg (1210-1285), Gertrude (1256-1301), and Mechthild of Hackeborn (1240-1298); the Scotch scholar and contemplative, Richard of St. Victor (d. c. 1173), the successor of Hugh of St. Victor; and Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153), belong to this period.

During the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries mysticism flamed anew in Italy in the lives of Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) and his followers, Jacapone da Todi and Angelo of Foligno.

Richard Rolle (d. 1349),and Julian of Norwich (works completed c. 1393), reveal the vitality of mystical religion in England during the fourteenth century.

The fourteenth century saw the flowering of a strong and rich type of mysticism in Germany also. Meister Eckhart (b. c. 1260) entered the Dominican order, and studied at Cologne and Paris, where he came under the influence of the

Following the close of the patristic period there are scant documentary indications of mystical religion until the eleventh and twelfth centuries, when a marked revival took place. Ruusbroec (1293-1381), the great statesman and sacerdotalist, revealed a strong mystical interest. The twelfth century is rich in mystical religion. The German nuns Hildegarde (1098-1179), who influenced the thirteenth century German women, Mechthild of Magdeburg (1210-1280), Gertrude (1256-1301), and Mechthild of Hackeborn (1240-1298); the Scotch scholar and contemplative, Richard of St. Victor (d. c. 1173), the successor of Hugh of St. Victor; and Bernard of Clairvaux (1091-1153), belong to this period.

During the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries mysticism flamed anew in Italy in the lives of Francis of Assisi (1182-1226) and his followers, Jacopone da Todi and Angela of Foligno.

Richard Rolle (d. 1349), and Julian of Norwich (wrote completed c. 1393), revived the vitality of mystical religion in England during the fourteenth century.

The fourteenth century saw the flowering of a strong and rich type of mysticism in Germany also. Meister Eckhart (b. c. 1260) entered the Dominican order, and studied at Cologne and Paris, where he came under the influence of the

great Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). His two disciples, the Dominicans Heinrich Suso (c. 1295-1365), and Johann Tauler (c. 1300-1361), spread the enthusiasm for Eckhart's type of piety to South Germany, whence appeared the remarkable anonymous work Theologia Germanica. The influence of Tauler gave rise to an association called the Friends of God, among whose leaders Nicolas of Basle and Rulman Merswin of Strassburg may be mentioned.

Contemporary with Tauler and Suso, and influenced by them, lived one of the greatest mystics of the church, John Ruysbroeck of Brussels (1293-1381), whose influence in turn led to the founding by Gerard Groote of The Brethren of the Common Life, a movement which spread through Holland and the Rhineland. Most probably Thomas a Kempis, author of the famous Imitation of Christ, belongs to this stream of mystical religious tradition.[1]

In Italy the splendors of mediaeval mysticism were summed up in Catherine of Siena (1347-1380), and Catherine of Genoa (1447-1510).

---

1 The Imitation is of debatable authorship. John Gersen, Abbot of Vercelli, has been championed by the French as its author, but Renan rejects this hypothesis. Thomas Haemerlin of Kempen is usually accepted as the author. Cf. Fleming, Mysticism in Christianity, p. 138.

great Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). His two disciples, the Dominiccs Heinrich Suso (c. 1295-1366), and Johann Tauler (c. 1300-1361), spread the enthusiasm for Eckhart's type of piety to South Germany, whence appeared the remarkable anonymous work Theologia Germanica. The influence of Tauler gave rise to an association called the Friends of God, among whose members Ulrich of Stadia and Julian Merswin of Strassburg may be mentioned.

Contemporary with Tauler and Suso, and influenced by them, lived one of the greatest mystics of the church, John Ruysbroeck of Brussels (1293-1381), whose influence in turn led to the founding by Gerard Groote of the Brethren of the Common Life, a movement which spread through Holland and the Rhineland. Most probably Thomas a Kempis, author of the famous Imitation of Christ, belongs to this stream of mystical religious tradition.[1]

In Italy the adherents of mediaeval mysticism were summed up in Catherine of Siena (1347-1380), and Catherine of Genoa (1447-1510).

---

1 The Imitation is of debatable authorship. John Gerson, Abbot of Vercelli, has been championed by the French as its author, but German replaces this by Gotthosis. Thomas Hemerlin of Zerzen is usually accepted as the author. Cf. Fleming, Mysticism in Christianity, p. 120.

Spanish mysticism developed in the sixteenth century in the life and writings of Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556), Peter of Alcantara (1499-1562), Teresa (1515-1582), and John of the Cross (1542-1597).

Meanwhile the chief contributions in France were made by Madame Acarie (1566-1618), François de Sales (1567-1622), Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), Brother Lawrence (1610-1691), the Quietists, chief among whom was Madame Guyon (1648-1715), and Fénelon (1651-1715).

Among the Protestant mystics may be numbered Jacob Boehme, the German cobbler (1575-1624), Angelus Silesius (Johann Scheffler, 1624-1677), George Fox, the English Quaker (1624-1691), John Woolman (1720-1772), and William Law (1686-1761).

Obviously we can neither examine the types of mysticism peculiar to each of these great personalities, nor reach a definition of mysticism which will do justice to all of them. But we may enumerate the salient characteristics of the general type of religious experience of which each is an example.

Characteristics of Christian Mysticism

1) In mysticism the individual seeks, and claims to realize, direct contact with, knowledge of, and identification with the divine

Spanish mysticism developed in the sixteenth century in the life and writings of Ignatius Loyola (1491-1556), Peter of Alcantara (1499-1562), Teresa (1515-1582), and John of the Cross (1542-1591).

Meanwhile the chief contribution in France were made by Madame Guyon (1648-1610), Francois de Salas (1567-1622), Blaise Pascal (1623-1662), Bossuet Lamenne (1610-1691), the Quietists, chief among whom was Madame Guyon (1648-1715), and Fenelon (1651-1715).

Among the Protestant mystics may be numbered Jacob Boehme, the German cobbler (1575-1624), Angelus Silesius (Johann Scheffler, 1624-1677), George Fox, the English thinker (1624-1691), John Wesley (1720-1772), and William Law (1686-1761).

Obviously we can neither examine the types of mysticism peculiar to each of these great personalities, nor reach a definition of mysticism which will do justice to all of them. But we may enumerate the salient characteristics of the general type of religious experience of which each is an example.

Characteristics of Christian mysticism

1) In mysticism the individual seeks, and claims to realize, direct contact with, knowledge of, and identification with the divine

nature. This is the central purpose of mystical religion, and is so recognized by most students of mysticism.[1]

2) In mysticism the individual eschews the outward, external, and sensuous, and relies upon the inner, spiritual faculties. He assumes that the soul, as well as the body, can see and perceive.[2] He seeks in every possible way, therefore, to sharpen and sensitize his inner powers, so that he may come into an immediate, direct apprehension of God.

3) The mystic practices spiritual discipline. In order on the one hand to render his inner powers more acute, and on the other to present himself to God in purity and holiness, the mystic employs spiritual exercises, and seeks to reduce to a minimum the demands of his physical nature. In many instances he employs a definite technique for the cultivation of the inner life.

---

1 Modern writers make this element central in their definitions of mysticism. Thus R. Jones:

> I use the word mysticism to express the type of religion which puts the emphasis on immediate awareness of relation with God . . Studies in Mystical Religion, p.xv.

W. E. Hocking: Mysticism is a way of dealing with God . . The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p. 355.

Dean Inge: . . . the attempt to realize the presence of the living God in the soul and in nature. . Christian Mysticism, p. 5.

2 Inge, Op. cit., p. 6.

4) The mystic's contact with reality bears moral fruits, and impels him to moral activity in the world. Love, the guide on the inner, upward path to God, becomes in practice the power of moral action. The mystic's claim to be in union with God is validated by his moral conduct in the world.

These four characteristics are sufficiently general to permit the inclusion of many peculiarities of individual mystics.

The "Mystic Way"

The third characteristic noted above, the employment of an inner technique in the search for, and effort to achieve immediate contact with reality, is the key to the real understanding of mysticism. The mystics employed a method; they cultivated the mystic way. They usually conceived the inner life as a series of ascending stages. The number and nature of these stages varied according to the temperamental peculiarities of individual mystics, but in general they may be classified under three heads: the purgative, the illuminative, and the unitive.

The purgative life

After the awakening of the soul the first stage in the upward climb of the spirit is that of purification or purgation. The mystics describe this experience chiefly in moral terms. First the normal

4) The mystic's contact with reality bears moral fruits, and impels him to moral activity in the world. Love, the radio on the inner, upward path to God, becomes in practice the power of moral action. The mystic's claim to be in union with God is validated by his moral conduct in the world.

These four characteristics are sufficiently general to permit the inclusion of many manifestations of individual mysticism.

The "Mystic Way" The third characteristic noted above, the employment of an inner technique in the search for, and effort to achieve immediate contact with reality, is the key to the real understanding of mysticism. The mystics employed a method: they cultivated the mystic way. They usually conceived the inner life as a series of consecutive stages. The number and nature of these stages varied according to the temperamental peculiarities of individual mysticism, but in general they may be classified under three heads: the purgative, the illuminative, and the unitive.

The purgative life After the awakening of the soul the first stage in the upward climb of the mystic is that of purification or purgation. The mystics describe this experience chiefly in moral terms. First the moral

attitudes of confession and contrition are adopted. The mystic approaches God in humility and penitence, and strives to make amendment for sin. A form of mental cleansing often follows, in which the mystic seeks to free his perception of hindering elements. By reflection he seeks self-knowledge, and exerts effort toward the simplification of life. In this mood he discovers the obstructive character of his "lower nature," and seeks detachment from it. Frequently he embraces the monastic virtues of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Among the great mystics some form of asceticism is adopted early in life. In the extreme mystics, such as Heinrich Suso, Madame Guyon, and others, this tendency leads to outright mortification of the flesh. Such practices, where maltreatment of the body is involved, are repudiated by the sounder mystics, and are regarded not only as unessential, but as perversions of the desire for spiritual detachment. The mystic seeks the death of his lower nature not as an end in itself, but as a means of purification, which in turn fits him for contact with God. His purgative efforts he regards as a struggle to disentangle himself from the web of sense and illusion, that he may attain unto the supreme spiritual reality, God.

The illuminative life His mind freed of the allurement of sense, his passions under control, and his spirit set toward God, the mystic enters upon the

attitudes of confession and contrition are adopted. The mystic approaches God in humility and penitence, and strives to make amendment for sin. A form of mental cleansing often follows, in which the mystic seeks to free his perception of hindering elements. By reflection he seeks self-knowledge, and exerts effort toward the simplification of life. In this mood he discovers the obstructive character of his "lower nature," and seeks detachment from it. Frequently he embraces the monastic virtues of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Among the great mystics some form of asceticism is adopted early in life. In the extreme mystics, such as Heinrich Suso, Madame Guyon, and others, this tendency leads to outright mortification of the flesh. Such practices, where maltreatment of the body is involved, are repudiated by the normal mystics, and are regarded not only as unessential, but as perversions of the desire for spiritual detachment. The mystic seeks the death of his lower nature not as an end in itself, but as a means of purification, which in turn fits him for contact with God. His purgative efforts he regards as a struggle to disentangle himself from the web of sense and illusion, that he may attain unto the supreme spiritual reality, God.

The illuminative life

His mind freed of the allurement of sense, his passions under control, and his spirit set toward God, the mystic enters upon the

second stage of the inner way, that of illumination. He concentrates all his faculties of will, intellect, and feeling upon God. His good works do not cease, but are performed willingly and spontaneously. His ethical struggle is transferred to the inner life. Concentrating on God, he achieves new conceptions of the divine, and new interpretations of conduct. Depending chiefly upon his mental and nervous constitution, his knowledge may come through visions and auditions, or other heightened forms of experience. Still conscious of his separation from God, the mystic apprehends new aspects of God, and divines new ways of approaching reality. His illumination may take the form of a glorious realization of God's immanence in nature (as with St. Francis); or the character of God may be revealed to him in symbols. This stage of illumination is joyous, affirmative, life-enriching. The mystic's spiritual energy is multiplied; his force and power are enormously increased.

In certain mystics the illuminative stage involves the perfection of certain peculiar methods of prayer and reflection. "Recollection," "quiet," "orison," and "mystical prayer," are some of the names given by the mystics to their methods of concentration upon God.

The unitive life — The first two stages of the mystic way are preparatory to the final

second stage of the inner way, that of illumination. He concentrates all his faculties of will, intellect, and feeling upon God. His good works do not cease, but are performed willingly and spontaneously. His ethical strength is transferred to the inner life. Concentrating on God, he achieves new conceptions of the divine, and new interpretations of conduct. Depending chiefly upon his mental and nervous constitution, his knowledge may come through visions and audiions, or other heightened forms of consciousness. Still conscious of his separation from God, the mystic apprehends new aspects of God, and divines new ways of approaching reality. His illumination may take the form of a glorious realization of God's immanence in nature (as with St. Francis); or the character of God may be revealed to him in symbols. This stage of illumination is joyous, affirmative, life-enriching. The mystic's spiritual energy is multiplied; his force and power are enormously increased.

In certain mystics the illuminative stage involves the perfection of certain peculiar methods of prayer and reflection. "Recollection," "quiet," "vision," and "mystical prayer," are some of the names given by the mystics to their methods of concentration upon God.

The unitive life The first two stages of the mystic way are preparatory to the final

stage of union with God. Here man seeks to behold God face to face, and to be joined to him in unity. Pure contemplation of the divine, interrupted by ecstatic experiences in which the subject feels himself freed from his own self and united with God, characterizes this stage of the mystic way. The joyous rapture of the ecstasy is for the mystic ineffable; liberated from his sense-bound thought, and carried up into the realm of the divine, he declares himself unable to describe the bliss, power, and beauty of his experience.

But the ecstatic experience is not permanent; it is highly infrequent, and does not exhaust the possibilities of the religious nature of the mystic. Life goes on; the world is still with him, late and soon. The mystic's union with God must find expression in life in that world. Whether he seeks to describe his unitive experience as "spiritual marriage" (Teresa and Catherine of Siena), or "deification," or in other equally extravagant terms, life continues to make its practical demands upon him. But the unitive life of the mystic claims for itself divine character and guidance. The soul which acts, loves, and worships is "I, yet not I." In a profound sense the soul is possessed forever by God, and is guided by a power not its own. The will of God becomes one with the will of the mystic, so that he no longer

stage of union with God. Here man seeks to behold God face to face, and to be joined to him in unity. Pure contemplation of the divine, interrupted by ecstatic experiences in which the subject feels himself freed from his own self and united with God, characterizes this stage of the mystic way. The longing rapture of the ecstasy is for the mystic ineffable; liberated from his sense-bound thought, and carried up into the realm of the divine, he declares himself unable to describe the bliss, power, and beauty of his experience.

But the ecstatic experience is not permanent; it is highly intermittent, and does not exhaust the possibilities of the religious nature of the mystic. Life goes on; the world is still with him, late and soon. The mystic's union with God must find expression in life in that world. Whether he seeks to describe his unitive experience as 'a virtual marriage' ("Teresa and Catherine of Siena), or 'deification,' or in other equally extravagant terms, life continues to make its practical demands upon him. But the unitive life of the mystic claims for itself divine character and evidence. The soul which acts, loves, and worships is 'I, yet not I.' In a profound sense the soul is possessed forever by God, and is guided by a power not its own. The will of God becomes one with the will of the mystic, so that he no longer

wishes for anything, nor fears anything, but feels himself the instrument of the divine.

The great mystics of the Christian tradition have never allowed vision or ecstasy to become the culmination of their spiritual quest. Their greatness as mystics is attested by the kind of practical life they led. The striking quality of their unitive life is exhibited in the creative vitality with which they carried on moral activity in the world.

We have here set forth, without comment or criticism, an account of the mystic way.[1] The division into three stages is wholly arbitrary, and carries with it no finality. Each mystic works out his own chart or plan for penetrating the unseen, and arriving at his ultimate goal of fellowship with God. The variety of plans is evidence of the genuineness of the mystics' experience.[2] We are not to suppose that each of the stages is reached in the order mentioned above, nor that any one stage must be regarded either as a pre-requisite for the next stage, or as the logical outcome of the preceding. Especially do the purgative and illuminative elements mutually intermingle and complement each other in the mystics' upward climb.

---

1 On the mystic way, cf. Underhill, Mysticism, pp. 198-231, 232-357; Inge, Christian Mysticism, pp. 10-12.

2 Leuba, Psychology of Religious Mysticism, pp. 162-183.

wishes for anything, nor fears anything, but feels himself the instrument of the divine.

The great mystics of the Christian tradition have never allowed vision or ecstasy to become the culmination of their spiritual quest. Their existence as mystics is attested by the kind of practical life they led. The striking quality of their unitive life is exhibited in the creative vitality with which they carried on moral activity in the world.

We have here set forth, without comment or criticism, an account of the mystic way.[1] The division into three stages is wholly arbitrary, and carries with it no finality. Each mystic works out his own chart or plan for penetrating the unseen, and arriving at his ultimate goal of fellowship with God. The variety of plans is evidence of the spontaneous of the mystics' experiences.[2] We are not to suppose that each of the stages is reached in the order mentioned above, nor that any one stage must be regarded either as a pre-requisite for the next stage, or as the logical outcome of the preceding. Typically do the purgative and illuminative elements mutually interchange and complement each other in the mystics' upward climb.

---

1 On the mystic way, cf. Underhill, Mysticism, pp. 188-231, 282-287; Inge, Christian Mysticism, pp. 10-12.

2 Inge, Psychology of Religious Mysticism, pp. 162-168.

Summary From our enumeration of the four characteristics of mysticism and our account of the mystic way, it is apparent that mysticism in the broad inclusive sense is a type of religious experience in which the whole life is heightened and ennobled by the maximum realization of religious values. Central in mysticism is the immediate contact of the individual with God. As this fellowship is sought, realized, and cherished, the fruits of religion in thought, emotion, and conduct of life issue in ever increasing richness. Through intense inner devotion, the mystic develops in marked degree the spiritual element common to normal religious life, and brings it to extraordinary power and fruition.[1]

Wholesome and Unwholesome types of Mysticism Throughout the course of religious history there have flourished many unwholesome types of mysticism, in which one or more of the

---

1 Father George Tyrrell, in his The Faith of the Millions, London: Longmans, 1902, p. 261 (quoted by Pratt, op. cit., p. 365) says:

> The saint differs from the ordinary Christian not in his mysticism but in the degree of his mysticism . . . The difference is that between the seed and the flower. But because there is a real continuity and sameness of kind, the saint is intelligible to us in that which is the very essence of his sanctity.

Summary

From our enumeration of the four characteristics of mysticism and our account of the mystic way, it is apparent that mysticism is the broad imaginative sphere in a type of religious experience in which the whole life is heightened and embolden by the maximum realization of religious values. Central in mysticism is the immediate contact of the individual with God. As this relationship is sought, realized, and cherished, the fruits of religion in thought, emotion, and conduct of life issue in ever increasing richness. Through intense inner devotion, the mystic develops in marked degree the spiritual element common to normal religious life, and brings it to extraordinary power and fruition.[1]

Wholesome and Unwholesome types of Mysticism

Throughout the course of religious history there have flourished many unwholesome types of mysticism, in which one or more of the

---

1 Rather George Tyrrell, in his The Faith of the Millions, London: Longmans, 1902, p. 261 (quoted by Pratt, op. cit., p. 365) says:

> The saint differs from the ordinary Christian not in his mysticism but in the degree of his mysticism . . . The difference is that between the seed and the flower. But because there is a real continuity and sameness of kind, the saint is intelligible to us in that which is the very essence of his sanctity.

four essential elements of religion noted at the outset of this chapter have been either distorted or forgotten. Today mysticism connotes to many minds the abnormal, unwholesome aberrations of religious fanatics who mistake the spectacular for the sublime and the extreme for the essential. It is necessary therefore to distinguish wholesome from unwholesome mysticism; to point out that in the mystical, as in the ethical, rational, or institutional types of religious experience, the subordinate elements play important parts. Unfortunately the English word "mysticism" connotes both wholesome and unwholesome mysticism. The distinction between the German "Mysticismus" and "Mystik" is edifying at this point. The meaning of the former was originally "anything marvellous or wierd," [1] but has been expanded in German usage to connote that form of supernatural exploitation which dispenses with moral values, cognitive processes, and historical fact. It suggests an excessive emphasis on feeling, a too ready acceptance of ecstasy and transport, rapture and ravishment, as the important elements in religious experience. [2] The glorification of abstraction, the pursuit of the _via negativa_, in which all sensible objects are elimin-

---

1 Leuba, _op. cit._, p. 2, note 1.

2 Underhill, _op. cit._, p. vii, "No responsible student (of mysticism) now identifies the mystic and the ecstatic."

four essential elements of religion noted at the outset of this chapter have been either distorted or forgotten. Today mysticism connotes to many minds the abnormal, wonderful-some perversions of religious fanatics who disturbe the equanimity for the sublime and the extreme for the essential. It is necessary therefore to distinguish sharply from malfeasance mysticism; to point out that in the mystical, as in the ethical, religious, or institutional types of religious experience, the subordinate elements play important parts. Unfortunately the English word "mysticism" connotes both wholesome and unwholesome mysticism. The distinction between the German "mystisismus" and "Mystik" is satisfying at this point. The meaning of the former was originally "anything marvellous or weird,"[1] but has been expanded in German usage to connote that form of supernatural exploitation which disappears with moral values, constructive processes, and disinterested fact. It suggests an excessive emphasis on feeling, a too ready acceptance of esoteric and transport, rapture and revelment, as the important elements in religious experience. The distinction of substitution, the pursuit of the via negativa, in which all sensible objects are alienated

---

1 Lomba, op. cit., p. 2, note 1.

2 Underhill, op. cit., p. vii, "To reconcile student (of mysticism) now identifies the mystic and the contemplative."

ated in the passionate effort to arrive at "Pure Being", and the adoption of a kind of moveless contemplation which seeks complete absorption of the soul in the "One," all turn out to be "only the backstairs to the Upper Room." [1]

We view as unwholesome such emasculated, non-moral, and unhistorical mysticism. No creative discussion of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics is possible against such a background. To Mysticismus of such a "ruinously exclusive" sort[2] Mystik is in happy contrast. Mystik, or mysticism in the wholesome sense of the term, connotes a sane, productive, inclusive type of religious experience in which thought, emotion, and will are engaged. Such a larger mysticism is historically grounded, socially environed, ethically conditioned. It benefits by orderly, rational processes as well as by contemplation; it gives free play to man's moral sense; it inspires its devotees to creative activity in the world.

The psychological basis of mystical experience

The psychologist has frequently taken the position that the peculiarities of mystical experience are to be explained on

---

1 Jones, op. cit., p. xxxvi. Cf. Hocking, op. cit., p.xviii.

2 Von Hügel, op. cit., Vol II, p. 351.

ted in the reasonable effort to arrive at 'Pure Being', and the adoption of a kind of moveless contemplation which seeks complete absorption of the soul in the 'One,' all turn out to be "only the backstairs to the Upper Room." [1]

We view as unnecessarily unmanageable, non-moral, and unhistorical mysticism. In creative discussion of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics is possible against such a background. To investigators of such a "rationally exclusive" sort mysticism is in happy contrast. Mysticism, or mysticism in the wholesome sense of the term, connotes a sane, productive, inclusive type of religious experience in which thought, emotion, and will are engaged. Such a larger mysticism is historically grounded, socially conscious, ethically conditioned. It benefits by orderly, rational processes as well as by contemplation; it gives free play to man's moral sense; it inspires its devotees to creative activity in the world.

The psychological basis of mystical experience

The psychologist has recognized by taking the position that the peculiarities of mystical experience are to be explained on

---

1 Jones, op. cit., p. xxxvi. Cf. Hocking, op. cit., p.xviii.

2 Von Hügel, op. cit., Vol II, p. 321.

psychological grounds. Trained to discover the abnormal in experience, he views mysticism as a particularly rich field for investigation. His contention is that in mystics who enjoy such extraordinary experiences as vision, audition, and ecstasy, corresponding abnormalities of the psycho-physical organism are to be found. Deftly he compares these mystical states of consciousness with typical abnormal states in secular life. Usually he is able to produce such striking parallelisms between religious vision and ordinary trance, between religious ecstasy and common hypnoid states, as practically to demonstrate the root of both religious and any other abnormal states of consciousness to lie in the abnormal functioning of the psycho-physical organism.

Now we do not disagree with the psychologist in linking certain extraordinary mystical states of consciousness to such psychological processes as self-hypnosis, auto-suggestion and auto-erotism. We regard mystical experience, when viewed as states of consciousness, as explicable in terms of the operation of psychological laws. But we are not always in agreement with the psychologist in his conclusions as to the meaning of these explanations for mysticism. Many psychologists conclude that if certain states of consciousness called mystical can be explained in terms of the conscious or subconscious working of the individual's

psychological grounds. Trained to discover the abnormal in experience, he views mysticism as a particularly rich field for investigation. His contention is that in mystics who enjoy such extraordinary experiences as vision, revelation, and ecstasy, corresponding abnormalities of the psycho-physical organism are to be found. Briefly he compares these mystical states of consciousness with typical abnormal states in ordinary life. Usually he is able to produce such striking parallelisms between religious vision and ordinary trance, between religious ecstasy and common hypnoid states, as practically to demonstrate the root of both religious and any other abnormal states of consciousness to lie in the abnormal functioning of the psycho-physical organism.

Now we do not disagree with the psychologist in finding certain extraordinary mystical states of consciousness to such psychological processes as self-hypnosis, auto-suggestion and auto-erotism. We regard mystical experiences, when viewed as states of consciousness, as explicable in terms of the operation of psychological laws. But we are not always in agreement with the psychologist in his conclusions as to the meaning of these explanations for mysticism. Many psychologists conclude that if certain states of consciousness called mystical can be explained in terms of the conscious or subconscious working of the individual's

own mind, the essential claim of the mystic to immediate experience of reality must be given up.[1]

Our position is that no matter how complete the psychological explanation of mystical states of consciousness, the ultimate truth and value of mysticism depends not upon the analysis of mysticism as states of consciousness, but upon the meaning of mysticism for the whole of life. Mysticism stands or falls not by a determination of the normal or abnormal functioning of the mystic's psycho-physical organism, but by the character and quality of life in the mystic. It has been demonstrated repeatedly that certain mystics possessed high-strung, sensitive temperaments, and that their psycho-physical organisms were exceedingly delicate, and often impaired. But these same mystics exhibited a quality of life which was wholesome and good. Thus the validity of any mystical experience, whether ecstatic, visionary, contemplative, or reflective, is determined by other than psychological considerations, namely, ethical and rational. Where strange mystical experiences become constitutive and authoritative for the subsequent life of the mystic, we cannot do better than to assume the position of a well-known psychologist who saw clearly the limitations of his science,

---

1 Leuba, op. cit., p. 316.

can mind, the essential claim of the mystic to immediate experience of reality must be given up.[1]

Our position is that no matter how complete the psychological examination of mystical states of consciousness, the ultimate truth and value of mysticism depends not upon the analysis of mysticism as states of consciousness, but upon the meaning of mysticism for the whole of life. Mystical states or fails not by a determination of the normal or abnormal functioning of the mystic's psycho-physical organism, but by the character and quality of life in the mystic. It has been demonstrated repeatedly that certain mystics possessed high-strung, sensitive temperaments, and that their psycho-physical organisms were exceedingly delicate, and often impaired. But these same mystics exhibited a quality of life which was wholesome and good. Thus the validity of any mystical experience, whether ecstatic, visionary, contemplative, or volitive, is determined by other than psychological considerations, namely, ethical and rational. Where strange mystical experiences become constitutive and authoritative for the subsequent life of the mystic, we cannot do better than to assume the position of a well-known psychologist who saw clearly the limitations of his science.

---

1 Leuba, op. cit., p. 316.

and declared that

> mystical states, when well developed, usually are, and have the right to be, absolutely authoritative over the individuals to whom they come,

but that

> no authority emanates from them which should make it a duty for those who stand outside of them to accept their revelations uncritically.[1]

Our conclusion therefore is that psychological explanation does not invalidate the claim of the mystic to be in contact with reality. Because reality manifests itself in human life in ethical and rational as well as psychological terms, we prefer to judge the validity of mysticism by its moral fruits rather than by its psychological roots.

This conclusion is significant for our study of Paul. The validity of his mystical experience is not determined by psychological explanation of his extraordinary revelations and visions, nor by reference to his psycho-physical organism, but by an appraisal of his conduct of life.

The mystic way of knowing

One of the characteristics of mystical experience is its <u>noetic</u> quality.[2]

---

1 James, <u>The Varieties of Religious Experience</u>, p. 422.

2 James, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 380.

and declared that

> mystical wisdom, when well developed, usually are, and have the right to be, absolutely authoritative over the individuals to whom they come.

but that

> no authority emanates from them which should make it a duty for those who stand outside of them to accept their revelations uncritically. 1

Our conclusion therefore is that psychological explanation does not invalidate the claim of the mystic to be in contact with reality. Because reality manifests itself in human life in ethical and rational as well as psychological terms, we prefer to judge the validity of mysticism by its moral fruits rather than by its psychological roots.

This conclusion is significant for our study of Yeats. The validity of his mystical experience is not determined by psychological explanation of his extraordinary revelations and visions, nor by reference to his psycho-physical organism, but by an appraisal of his conduct of life.

The mystic way of knowing

One of the characteristics of mystical experience is its noetic quality. 2

---

1 James, The Varieties of Religious Experience, p. 422.

2 James, op. cit., p. 420.

The mystic lays claim to knowledge which though immediate and authoritative, is frequently ineffable. Paul, carried up into the third heaven, heard words unlawful for man to utter.[1] The problem arises, does the mystic employ a special faculty, a peculiar mystic sense with which he penetrates realms of knowledge closed to the ordinary cognitive faculties of humankind? Does he learn truth which is beyond the possibility of other men to know? Is there a special mystic sense or self which reaches farther and acquires higher knowledge than the normal sense or self can reach or acquire? How does the mystic get his knowledge? This problem is important not only for mysticism generally, but as a ground for our subsequent discussion of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics.

There are those who affirm that in mystical experience the subject becomes a transcendental self, or at least a different self from the ordinary one, and exercises a special mystical faculty or sense.[2] The clearest and most

---

1 II Cor 12:4.

2 Hocking, op. cit., pp. 370-371 shows that the mystics themthemselves often speak as though this were true:

> The names which the mystics have invented for this special faculty are curious and wonderful, yet not without power of suggestion. . It is called the Spark of the soul (Fünklein, Eckhart; Scintilla, Bonaventura), the Apex of the soul, also the Ground of the soul, further, its Groundless Nothing, its Right Eye, its Upward Face, its Innermost, and the like.

The mystic lays claim to knowledge which through immediate and authoritative, is frequently inaccessible. Paul, carried up into the third heaven, heard words unlawful for man to utter.[1] The problem arises, does the mystic employ a special faculty, a peculiar mystic sense with which he penetrates realms of knowledge closed to the ordinary cognitive faculties of humanity? Does he learn truth which is beyond the possibility of other men to know? Is there a special mystic sense or self which reaches further and acquires higher knowledge than the normal sense or self can reach or acquire? How does the mystic get his knowledge? This problem is important not only for mysticism generally, but as a ground for our subsequent discussion of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics.

There are those who affirm that in mystical experience the subject becomes a transcendental self, or at least a different self from the ordinary one, and exercises a special mystical faculty or sense.[2] The clearest and most

---

1 II Cor 12:4.

2 Hocking, op. cit., pp. 370-371 shows that the mystics themselves often speak as though this were true:
> The names which the mystics have invented for this special faculty are curious and wonderful, yet not without power of suggestion. . It is called the Spark of the soul (Wenklein, Scintilla; Meister Eckhart, Funkenkorn), the Apex of the soul, also the Ground of the soul, Further, its Groundless Nothing, its Night Eye, its Upward Face, its Innermost, and the like.

outright characterization of the mystic sense as special, and the mystic self as transcendental, is found in Evelyn Underhill:

> Neither conation nor cognition - action or thought - as performed by this surface mind, concerned as it is with natural existence and dominated by spatial conceptions, is able to set up any relations with the Absolute or transcendental world. Such action and thought deal wholly with material supplied directly or indirectly by the world of sense. The testimony of the mystics, however, and of all persons possessing an 'instinct for the Absolute,' points to the existence of a further faculty, - indeed a deeper self - in man, a self which the circumstances of diurnal life usually keep 'below the threshold' of his consciousness, and which thus becomes one of the factors of his 'subliminal life.' This hidden self is the primary agent of mysticism, and lives a 'substantial' life in touch with the real or transcendental world. [1]
>
> Mysticism is seen to be a highly specialized form of that search for reality . . It is largely prosecuted by that 'spiritual spark', that transcendental faculty which, though the life of our life, remains below the threshold in ordinary men. [2]

That such a special mystical sense, involving as it does the duality of personality and the transcendence of empirical methods of thought by a particular type of intuition, is not recognized by students of mysticism generally is witnessed by the direct and indirect attacks made upon it.

---

1 Underhill, Mysticism, p. 67. 2 Ibid, p. 93.

outright characterization of the mystic sense as special, and the mystic self as transcendental, is found in Evelyn Underhill:

> Neither conviction nor cognition - action or thought - as performed by this surface mind, concerned as it is with material existence and dominated by spatial conceptions, is able to act on any relations with the Absolute or transcendental world. Such action and thought deal wholly with material supplied directly or indirectly by the world of sense. The testimony of the mystics, however, and of all persons possessing an 'instinct for the Absolute,' points to the existence of a further faculty, - indeed a deeper self - in man, a self which the circumstances of diurnal life usually keep 'below the threshold' of his consciousness, and which time becomes one of the factors of his 'subliminal life.' This hidden self is the primary agent of mysticism, and lives a 'substantial' life in touch with the real or transcendental world.[1]

> Mysticism is seen to be a highly specialized form of that search for reality . . . It is largely prescribed by that 'spiritual sense', that transcendental faculty which, though the life of our life, remains below the threshold in ordinary men.[2]

That such a special mystical sense, involving as it does the duality of personality and the transcendence of empirical methods of thought by a certain type of intuition, is not recognized by students of mysticism generally is witnessed by the direct and indirect attacks made upon it.

---

1 Underhill, Mysticism, p. 67. 2 Ibid, p. 93.

Pratt says,

> I have said nothing of Miss Underhill's hypothesis of a 'mystic sense' which, though it has 'attachments to emotion, to intellect, and to will,' 'differs from and transcends the emotional, intellectual, and volitional life of ordinary men.' I say nothing of it in part because Miss Underhill herself seems to be utterly uncertain as to what she means by it. So far as she uses it to mean a heightening of the ordinary mental powers, there is nothing to be said; so far as she means by it literally a different and special faculty, I need hardly point out that psychology knows absolutely nothing about it. [1]

In the same strain Selbie and Von Hügel speak:

> There is no such instinct. In religion, as in all man's reactions to the universe, the whole man is active. Intellect, feeling, and will all have their part to play. [2]

> Is there, then, strictly speaking, such a thing as a specifically distinct, self-sufficing, purely Mystical mode of apprehending Reality? I take it, distinctly not; and that all the errors of the Exclusive Mysticism proceed precisely from the contention that Mysticism does constitute such an entirely separate, completely self-supported kind of human experience. [3]

What then is the precise character of the mystic's mode of apprehension? Our answer is that the intuition of the mystic partakes of the characteristics of all intuitive knowledge; it is conditioned by the same supplementary cognitive elements, but derives its degree of certainty and

---

1 Pratt, The Religious Consciousness, pp. 447-448, note 7.

2 Selbie, The Psychology of Religion, p. 248.

3 Von Hügel, op. cit., Vol II, p.283.

Pratt says,

> I have said nothing of Miss Underhill's hypothesis of a 'mystic sense' which, though it has 'attachments to emotion, to intellect, and to will,' 'differs from and transcends the emotional, intellectual, and volitional life of ordinary man.' I say nothing of it in part because Miss Underhill herself seems to be utterly uncertain as to what she means by it. So far as she uses it to mean a heightening of the ordinary mental powers, there is nothing to be said; so far as she means by it literally a different and special faculty, I need hardly point out that psychology knows absolutely nothing about it.[1]

In the same strain Sabiba and Von Hügel assert,

> There is no such instinct. In religion, as in all man's reactions to the universe, the whole man is active. Intellect, feeling, and will all have their part to play.[2]

> In those, then, strictly speaking, such a thing as a specifically distinct, self-sufficing, purely mystical mode of apprehending Reality I take it, distinctly not; and that all the efforts of the exclusive mystic to prove precisely from the contention that mysticism does constitute such an entirely separate, completely self-supported kind of human experience.[3]

What then is the precise character of the mystic's mode of apprehension? Our answer is that the intuition of the mystic partakes of the characteristics of all intuitive knowledge; it is conditioned by the same supplementary cognitive elements, but derives its degree of certainty and

---

1 Pratt, The Religious Consciousness, pp. 447-448, note 7.

2 Sabiba, The Psychology of Religion, p. 266.

3 Von Hügel, op. cit., Vol II, p. 365.

assurance of objectivity partly from the strong admixture of emotion to be found in it, and partly from the nature of the object which it explores.

There is no occasion for pronouncing the mystic's mode of apprehension a law unto itself. Although the mystic himself claims that the object of his intuition is beyond description, or ineffable, he may be confusing within his own mind the experience of the object with the object itself. Hocking points out [1] that what is a psychological report is often taken as a metaphysical statement. So when the mystic tells us that "Reality is ineffable," what he is really saying is, "My experience of Reality is ineffable." [2]

The mystic way of knowing may appear super-rational or supersensuous [3] to the mystic himself, but in reality be quite dependent upon ordinary thought processes. Imagination plays a leading role in the mystic way of knowing. Imagination gathers into itself the data provided by racial memory; it includes congenital tendencies, stored up traces of the past, previous reflection and belief. No respected mystic has presumed to cut himself off utterly from history.

---

1 Hocking, "The Meaning of Mysticism as Seen Through its Psychology," Mind, N. S. XXI, 1912, pp. 38-61; cf. Leuba, op. cit., p. 312.

2 Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p. 354.

3 W. P. Montague, The Ways of Knowing, p. 54.

assurance of objectivity partly from the direct existence of qualities to be found in it, and partly from the nature of the object which it calls real.

There is no occasion for questioning the mystic's mode of apprehension a law unto itself. Although the mystic himself claims that the object of his intuitions is beyond description, or ineffable, it may be confusing within his own mind the experience of the reality with the object itself. Hocking points out 1 that what is a psychological report is often taken as a metaphysical statement. So when the mystic tells us that "Reality is ineffable," what he is really saying is, "the experience of reality is ineffable." 2

The mystic way of knowing may appear super-rational or supernatural to the mystic himself, but in reality is quite dependent upon ordinary thought processes. Imagination plays a leading role in the mystic's way of knowing. Imagination gathers into itself the data provided by racial memory; it includes conceptualized tendencies, stored up sources of the past, previous reflection and belief. The perceptive mystic has pre-[illegible] not wholly, from [illegible].

---

1 Hocking, "The Meaning of the Mystic's Own Report of his Experience," [illegible], 1912, pp. 38-41; cf. Leuba, Op. cit., p. 315.

2 Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p. 354.

3 W. T. [illegible], The [illegible] of [illegible], p. 32.

Hocking declares vigorously that

> the unhistorical mystic is a liar.[1]

Regarding the content of the revelation intuitively mediated to the mystic, Coe asserts,

> . . . the mystical revelation can be traced down to the formal conditions, physiological and psychological, of the mystic himself . . The mystic acquires his religious convictions precisely as his non-mystical neighbor does, namely through tradition and instruction grown habitual, and reflective analysis. The mystic brings his theological beliefs to the mystic experience; he does not derive them from it.[2]

This is a rather extreme view; it virtually disallows any creative power in the mystic experience.

The key to a fair interpretation of the mystic way of knowing therefore appears to be synthesis rather than analysis. We have taken the position that in mysticism, as in types of religion yielding ascendancy to any of the other three elements in religion, the <u>whole man</u> is operative. Intuition as found in the mystic is a concentration of all the energies of the personality, - an intensification of

---

1 Hocking, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 512.

2 Coe, "The Sources of the Mystical Revelation," <u>Hibbert Journal</u>, January, 1908, pp. 364-367; cf. Pratt, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 450.

Boehme declares vigorously that

> the undeterred mystic is a liar.[1]

Asserting the content of the revelation intuitively mediated to the mystic, Coe asserts:

> . . . the mystical revelation can be traced down to the formal conditions, physiological and psychological, of the mystic himself . . . The mystic acquires his religious convictions precisely as his non-mystical neighbor does, namely through tradition and instruction grown habitual, and reflective analysis. The mystic brings his theological beliefs to the mystic experience; he does not derive them from it.[2]

This is a rather extreme view; it virtually disallows any creative power in the mystic experience.

The way to a fair interpretation of the mystic way of knowing therefore appears to be synthesis rather than analysis. We have taken the position that in mysticism, as in types of religion yielding secondary to any of the other three elements in religion, the whole man is operative. Intuition as found in the mystic is a concentration of all the energies of the personality, - an intensification of

---

1 Hoeltzer, op. cit., p. 312.

2 Coe, "The Source of the Mystical Revelation," Hibbert Journal, January, 1908, pp. 364-367. cf. Pratt, op. cit., p. 420.

emotion, will, and intellect,[1] a forward and outward thrust of personality in which, though not necessarily immediately present in the awareness of the mystic, the social, temporal, and conceptual elements of past and present experience are effective.[2]

Students of mysticism are profoundly impressed by the insistent claim of the great mystics to a deep knowledge of God mediated through mystical states of consciousness. Thoughtful writers refuse to close the door to the possibility of the mystic's attaining some larger and deeper knowledge than that which he might acquire through ordinary mental processes. To leave this door open, James developed his theory of the wider margin of consciousness among mystics, with its corresponding "over-belief".[3]

---

1 Von Hügel, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 283-284:

> . . even the most exclusively mystical-seeming soul, ever depends for the fulness and healthiness of even the most purely mystical of its acts and states, as really upon its past and present contacts with the Contingent, Temporal and Spatial, and with social facts and elements, as upon its movement of concentration and the sense and experience, evoked on occasion of those contacts, or of their memories, of the Infinite within and around those finitudes and itself. Cf. Leuba, op. cit., p. 312.

2 Jones, op. cit., p. xxxiv, There are no 'pure experiences', i.e., no experiences which come wholly from beyond the person who has them.

3 James, op. cit., pp. 508-517.

emotion, will, and intellect,[1] a forceful and outward thrust of personality in which, though not necessarily immediately present in the awareness of the mystic, the social, temporal, and conceptual elements of past and present experience are effective.[2]

Students of mysticism are profoundly impressed by the insistent claim of the great mystics to a deep knowledge of God mediated through mystical states of consciousness. Thoughtful writers refuse to close the door to the possibility of the mystics obtaining some larger and deeper knowledge than that which he might acquire through ordinary mental processes. To leave this door open, James developed his theory of the wider margin of consciousness among mystics, with its corresponding "over-belief".[3]

---

1 Von Hügel, op. cit., Vol. II, pp. 326-324:

> . . even the most exclusively mystical-seeming soul, over demands for the fullness and healthiness of even the most purely mystical of its acts and states, as reality upon its past and present contacts with the Continuent, Temporal and Spatial, and with social facts and elements, as upon its movement of concentration and the sense and experience, evoked on occasion of those contacts, or of their memories, of the Infinite within and around those finitudes and itself. Cf. Leuba, op. cit., p. 312.

2 Jones, op. cit., p. xxxiv. There are no 'pure experiences', i.e., no experiences which come wholly from beyond the person who has them.

3 James, op. cit., pp. 309-317.

Montague, discussing mysticism as a way of knowing, allows for a like possibility.[1] Pratt asks, in a passage of moving power,

> May it, then, perhaps be that the mystics are the seers of our world, and that whenever they open the eyes of their souls, the Eternal light pours in; and that though we blind ones learnedly describe, generalize, and explain their experience by regular psychological laws which take account only of the psycho-physical organism, still the light is really there, and the mystic apprehends it, as he says? This question is not for psychological discussion. . . nothing that it can say should prevent the religious man, who wishes to be perfectly loyal to logic and loyal to truth, from seeing in his own spiritual experiences the genuine influence of a living God.[2]

When we describe the mystic way of knowing in the mystic's own terms, we find him using the word <u>love</u>. What the mystic learns about God he claims to learn through the way of love. Whatever may be the ultimate relations of love and truth psychologically or metaphysically, for the man of religion the alliance of love and knowledge is highly significant. The knowledge attained by those who love God is tinctured with high emotion, and held in passionate embrace. Such knowledge seems different in kind to the mystic;

---

1 Montague, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 58.

2 Pratt, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 458.

Montaigne, discussing mysticism as a way of knowing, allows for a like possibility.[1] Pratt says, in a passage of moving power.

> May it, then, perhaps be that the mystics are the seers of our world, and that wherever they open the eyes of their souls, the Eternal Light pours in; and that though we bind some learnedly describe, generalize, and explain their experience by rationalist psychological lens which take account only of the psycho-physical organism, still the light is really there, and the mystic experiences it, as he says? This question is not for psychological discussion. . . nothing that it can say should prevent the religious man, who wishes to be perfectly loyal to logic and loyal to truth, from analyze in his own spiritual experiences the genuine influence of a living God.[2]

When we describe the mystic way of knowing in the mystic's own terms, we find him using the word *love*. What the mystic learns about God he claims to learn through the way of love. Whatever may be the ultimate relations of love and truth psychologically or metaphysically, for the man of religion the alliance of love and knowledge is highly significant. The knowledge attained by those who love God is tinctured with high emotion, and held in passionate embrace. Such knowledge seems different in kind to the mystic;

---

1 Montaigne, op. cit., p. 82.

2 Pratt, op. cit., p. 486.

the seal of love is set upon it, thereby rendering it inviolable. The intense emotional nature of the mystic is the contingent element which a religious, rather than a merely psychological or epistemological, interpretation of the mystic way of knowing, takes into account.

Need we add that all mystic knowledge, however dearly cherished, is always subject to verification by what is outside it, and related to it? The practical verification of mystic knowledge represents one angle of approach to the problem which we must now consider, - the relation of mysticism to ethics.

Chapter III

Mysticism and Ethics

Definition of terms

Ethics is the name generally given to the science[1] of moral philosophy. The word is derived from the Greek ἠθικός, that which pertains to ἦθος, character.

> Ethics then is usually confined to the particular field of human character and conduct so far as they depend upon or exhibit certain general principles. Men in general characterize their own conduct and character and that of other men by such general adjectives as good, bad, right and wrong, and it is the meaning and scope of these adjectives, primarily in relation to human conduct, and ultimately in their final and absolute sense, that ethics investigates.[2]

In short,

> Ethics is the normative science of morals, which means that it is the attempt to discover and justify reasonable standards of conduct.[3]

It is a normative science, i.e., it deals not only with the actual and necessary, but with the ideal and possible; it

---

1 There is some question as to whether the word science can legitimately be used here. Science of conduct is regarded by Williams as an inexact definition, because sciences are descriptive and experimental, while ethics must be regarded properly as a branch of philosophy. This difficulty is overcome by Brightman's definition of ethics as a normative science.

2 H. H. Williams, "Ethics," Encyclopedia Brittanica, 11th edition, Vol. IX, p. 808.

3 E. S. Brightman, Moral Laws, p. 13.

Definition of terms

Ethics is the name generally given to the science of moral philosophy. The word is derived from the Greek ἠθικός, that which pertains to ἦθος, character.

> Ethics then is usually confined to the particular field of human character and conduct so far as they depend upon or exhibit certain general principles. Man in general characterize their own conduct and character and that of other men by such general adjectives as good, bad, right and wrong, and it is the meaning and scope of these adjectives, primarily in relation to human conduct, and ultimately in their final and absolute sense, that ethics investigates.[2]

In short,

> Ethics is the normative science of morals, which means that it is the attempt to discover and justify reasonable standards of conduct.[3]

It is a normative science, i.e., it deals not only with the actual and necessary, but with the ideal and possible; it

---

1 There is some question as to whether the word science can legitimately be used here. Science of conduct is regarded by Williams as an improper definition, because sciences are descriptive and experimental, while ethics must be regarded properly as a branch of philosophy. This difficulty is overcome by Brightman's definition of ethics as a normative science.

2 H. R. Williams, "Ethics," Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, Vol. IX, p. 808.

3 E. S. Brightman, Moral Laws, p. 12.

estimates the value of facts, and deals with what ought to be. Its chief concerns are law (principles), value (the good), and obligation (ought, duty).[1]

Morals and morality refer to the actual conduct of human individuals and societies.[2] Ethics, as contrasted with morals, refers to the theory of the good life; morals to the actual practice of it (successful or unsuccessful).[3] Morality is not merely a matter of custom and convention, for the relation of ideals of goodness to social customs is usually involved.[4]

Frequent use is made in this thesis of the adjectives ethical and moral. Although it is impossible to draw a sharp distinction between the two, in the main the adjective ethical is used to suggest the theoretical, or scientific element, with reference to moral (ethical) principles, or the ethical (or moral) system; moral is used in the wider sense, and may refer either to the science or the practice of right conduct.[5]

---

1 Ibid.

2 Brightman, Introduction to Philosophy, p. 388.

3 Brightman, Moral Laws, p. 11. 4 Ibid, p. 12.

5 Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, Springfield: Merriam, 1930, ad loc.

estimates the value of ideas, and deals with what ought to be. The chief concerns are law (principles), value (the good), and obligation (duty).[1]

Morals and morality refer to the actual conduct of human individuals and societies.[2] Ethics, as contrasted with morals, refers to the theory of the good life; morals to the actual practice of it (successful or unsuccessful).[3] Morality is not merely a matter of custom and conformity, for the relation of ideals of goodness to social customs is usually involved.[4]

Frequent use is made in this thesis of the adjectives ethical and moral. Although it is impossible to draw a sharp distinction between the two, in the main the adjective ethical is used to suggest the theoretical, or scientific element, with reference to moral (ethical) principles, or the ethical (or moral) system; moral is used in the other sense, and may refer either to the science or the practice of right conduct.[5]

---

1 Ibid.

2 Wright-Sharp, Introduction to Philosophy, p. 355.

3 Durkheim, Moral Laws, p. 17. 4 Ibid, p. 18.

5 Webster's New International Dictionary of the English Language, Springfield: Merriam, 1950, ad loc.

The relation of religion to ethics

Since mysticism as we are viewing it is a type or element of religion, the relation of mysticism to ethics will be illuminated by an inquiry concerning the possible relation of religion to ethics. Whatever may have been the relation of religion to ethics in primitive times, it is apparent that in the great historical religions[1] the relationship is real, and in some instances, very close . The growth of religion toward higher levels is marked by an increasing concern for moral behavior. The refinement of religion has been due not only to the transition from animism through polytheism to monotheism, but to the development of highly moralized conceptions of deity and the cultivation of moral values. For example, the work of the prophets of Israel, culminating in the ministry and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, must be regarded as the strengthening, enlarging, and purifying factor in the Hebrew religious tradition. It is difficult to find among the historical religions any type in which ethics played no part.

---

1 G. F. Moore, History of Religions, Vol. I, p. v ff., includes the following am ong the historical religions: Taoism, Confucianism, Brahmanism and the religion of the Upanishads, the religions of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, Zoroastrianism, the Orphic-Pythagorean movement in Greece, Buddhism, Hinduism, Mohammedanism, Shintoism, Judaism, and Christianity.

The relation of religion to ethics. Since mysticism as we are viewing it is a type or element of religion, the relation of mysticism to ethics will be illuminated by an inquiry concerning the possible relation of religion to ethics. Whatever may have been the relation of religion to ethics in primitive times, it is apparent that in the great historical religions[1] the relationship is real, and in some instances, very close. The growth of religion toward higher levels is marked by an increasing concern for moral behavior. The refinement of religion has been due not only to the transition from animism through polytheism to monotheism, but to the development of highly humanized conceptions of deity and the cultivation of moral values. For example, the work of the prophets of Israel, culminating in the ministry and teaching of Jesus of Nazareth, must be regarded as the strengthening, enlarging, and purifying factor in the Hebrew religious tradition. It is difficult to find among the historical religions any type in which ethics plays no part.

---

1 F. Moore, History of Religions, Vol. I, p. v ff., includes the following as one the historical religions: Zoroastrianism, Brahmanism and the religion of the Upanishads, the religions of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, Confucianism, the Orphic-Pythagorean movement in Greece, Buddhism, Zionism, Mohammedanism, Christianity, Judaism, and Christianity.

On the other hand, instances of well developed ethical systems which are relatively free from religious interest are not so rare. Some of the great ethical systems have been utterly devoid of any conscious dependence upon religion, and by the same token, upon mysticism. The pagan moralists deduced their ethical systems not from the revealed will of God, but from nature and reason. Conformity to nature was commonly regarded by the Greek philosophers as the end for man and the fundamental requirement of all moral action.[1] Interpreting conformity to nature in terms of the gratification of the senses, the Epicurean,

> with his heritage from Aristippus the Cyrenaic said pleasure, of which the senses were to be the judges,[2]

constituted the supreme ethical standard. Seneca the Stoic voiced a similar conviction when he said,

> We have a habit of saying that the highest good is to live according to nature.[3]

But the Stoic differed from the Epicurean in that he based his ethic not on sense but on reason, and sought virtue rather than pleasure. Stoic virtue had no religious reference; it was not sought for the sake of conforming life to a higher power, but

---

1 Enslin, The Ethics of Paul, p. 19.

2 Ibid.

3 Seneca, de Otio, 5 (31) 1, quoted by Enslin, op. cit., p.19.

On the other hand, instances of well developed ethical systems which are relatively free from religious interests are not so rare. Some of the great ethical systems have been utterly devoid of any conscious dependence upon religion, and by the same token, upon mysticism. The pagan moralists deduced their ethical systems not from the revealed will of God, but from nature and reason. Conformity to nature was commonly regarded by the Greek philosophers as the end for man and the fundamental requirement of all moral action.[1] Interpreting conformity to nature in terms of the gratification of the senses, the Epicureans,

> with his heritage from Aristippus the Cyrenaic said pleasure, of which the senses were to be the judges,[2]

constituted the supreme ethical standard. Seneca the Stoic voiced a similar conviction when he said,

> We have a habit of saying that the highest good is to live according to nature.[3]

But the Stoic differed from the Epicurean in that he based his ethic not on sense but on reason, and sought virtue rather than pleasure. Stoic virtue had no religious reference; it was not sought for the sake of conforming life to a higher power, but

---

1 Zwelin, The Values of Fame, p. 12.

2 Ibid.

3 Seneca, de Otio, 5 (31) 1, quoted by Zwelin, op. cit., p.12.

for its own sake. Stoicism stands as one of the great pagan ethics of antiquity. The writings of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius exhibit a noble and lofty ethical teaching which is untouched by religious, much less by mystical, interest or influence.

In modern times it is not uncommon to find individuals in whom a high type of morality is unaccompanied by any religious experience. Many moderns pride themselves on living morally satisfactory lives without recourse to religion. The contemporary Russian experiment avowedly seeks the attainment of values for the individual and the masses, and may therefore be regarded as moral in purpose. But it expressly disclaims any use for or dependence upon religion. Both antiquity and modernity therefore offer examples of ethics and morality without conscious religious attachments.

From this inquiry into the possible exclusive character of the two fields, it is evident that religion commonly involves ethics, but that ethics does not necessarily involve religion. This again is a minimum definition of relationship, and needs to be augmented and expanded by consideration of the possible inclusive character of the two terms.

for its own sake. Stoicism stands as one of the great pagan ethics of antiquity. The writings of Seneca, Epictetus, and Marcus Aurelius exhibit a noble and lofty ethical teaching which is sustained by religious, much less by mystical, interest or influence.

In modern times it is not uncommon to find individuals in which a high type of morality is unaccompanied by any religious experience. Many moderns pride themselves on living morally satisfactory lives without recourse to religion. The contemporary Russian experiment overwhelmingly asserts the ultimate of values for the individual and the masses, and may therefore be regarded as moral in purpose. But it expressly disclaims any use for or dependence upon religion. Both antiquity and modernity therefore offer examples of ethics and morality without conscious religious attachments.

From this inquiry into the possible exclusive character of the two fields, it is evident that religion commonly involves ethics, but that ethics does not necessarily involve religion. This again is a minimum definition of relationship, and needs to be augmented and accended by consideration of the possible inclusive character of the two terms.

Interaction of religion and ethics

Religion with a minimum of ethical interest, and ethics with no religious interest, are the exception and not the rule. In human history the rule is interaction, intimacy of relationship, rich and manifold interplay of the moral and religious elements. The relationship has obviously not been one of absolute coordination. There is no justification for saying that at any given stage in history the most completely developed religion also represented the most perfect morality. Indeed, their rate of development is practically never the same. In any given personality, or in any given race, it is evident that inequalities exist, so that the nice balance between a best possible ethic and a best possible faith is seldom struck.[1]

Interaction of religion and ethics in Christianity

The variety of ways in which religion and ethics interact may be illustrated by a study of the relationship within Christianity.

1) Here it is apparent, first of all, that in the interaction of the two elements religion is decisive, determinative, and primary. As ethics unites with religion in Christianity, it undergoes profound transformation. It is no longer a branch

---

1 Von Hügel, The Mystical Element of Religion, Vol. II, p. 272.

Interaction of religion and ethics

Religion with a minimum of ethical interest, and ethics with no religious interest, are the exception and not the rule. In human history the rule is interaction, intensity of relationship, rich and manifold interplay of the moral and religious elements. The relationship has obviously not been one of absolute coordination. There is no justification for saying that at any given stage in history the most completely developed religion also represented the most perfect morality. Indeed, their rate of development is practically never the same. In any given personality, or in any given race, it is evident that inequalities exist, so that the nice balance between a best possible ethic and a best possible faith is seldom struck.[1]

Interaction of religion and ethics in Christianity

The variety of ways in which religion and ethics interact may be illustrated by a study of the relationship within Christianity.

If there it is apparent, first of all, that in the interaction of the two elements religion is dominant, determinative, and primary. As ethics unites with religion in Christianity, it undergoes profound transformation. It is no longer a branch

---

1 Von Hügel, The Mystical Element of Religion, Vol. II, p. 374.

of philosophy; it no longer deduces its principles from nature or reason, but from the revealed will of God. In Christianity ethics becomes religious ethics; moral precepts are the deliverances of the religious consciousness. As H. H. Williams puts it,

> (In Christianity) it is assumed that divine commands have been implicitly given for all occasions of life, and that they are to be ascertained in particular cases by interpretation of the general rules obtained from texts of scripture and by inference from scriptural examples. This juridical method descended naturally from the Jewish theocracy. . . Moral insight, in the view of the most thoughtful Jews of the age immediately preceding Christianity, was conceived as knowledge of a divine code, emanating from an authority external to human reason which had only the function of interpreting and applying its rules.[1]

Thus Christianity tends to assume an independent human ethic. God, the "Champion and Defender"[2] of right, wills right, and encourages the righteous. His will takes precedence over the human moral imperative, and gives to the believer the power which belongs to God.[3] The motivation of moral conduct is thereby removed from the human to the divine realm. The moral principles of Christian ethics are rooted in the char-

---

1 "Ethics," Encyclopedia Brittanica, Vol. IX, p. 820, (11th edition).

2 Everett, Moral Values, p. 395.

3 Baillie, The Interpretation of Religion, p. 326.

of philosophy; it no longer deduces its principles from nature or reason, but from the revealed will of God. In Christianity ethics becomes religious ethics; moral precepts are the ordinances of the religious consciousness. As G. E. Williams puts it,

> (In Christianity) it is assumed that divine commands have been implicitly given for all occasions of life, and that they are to be ascertained in particular cases by interpretation of the general rules obtained from texts of scripture and by inference from scriptural examples. This juridical method descended naturally from the Jewish theocracy. . . Moral insight, in the view of the most thoughtful form of the age immediately preceding Christianity, was conceived as knowledge of a divine code, emanating from an authority external to human reason which had only the function of interpreting and applying its rules.[1]

Thus Christianity tends to assume an independent human ethic. God, the "Champion and Defender" of right, wills right, and encourages the righteous. His will takes precedence over the human moral imperative, and gives to the believer the power which belongs to God.[2] The motivation of moral conduct is thereby removed from the human to the divine realm. The moral principles of Christian ethics are rooted in the omni-

---

1 "Ethics," Encyclopedia Brittanica, Vol. IX, p. 800. (11th edition).

2 Everett, Moral Values, p. 202.

3 Baillie, The Interpretation of Religion, p. 326.

acter of God. Christianity is enormously effective in the moral life because it gives to moral ideas a cosmic backing, which in turn imparts to the moral ideas emotional intensity and spiritual quality. When man puts his trust in a morally good God, and conceives his moral consciousness as subject to and coordinate with God's will, he has grasped a most compelling sanction for moral conduct. His whole life, including of course his moral life, becomes religious. His ethics becomes Christian ethics.

2) Religion and ethics interact in Christianity in such fashion that the hard striving after moral perfection is transformed into a joyous experience of moral power. God, the author of the moral law, is also the helper toward its realization. When the believer puts himself humbly in fellowship with God, attains right relationship with him, he has linked his life to a never-failing source of moral power.[1] In this linkage the mysterious miracle of "grace" is wrought; the believer no longer considers his moral fitness to enjoy fellow-

---

1 Shadworth Hodgson, Metaphysics of Experience, IV, pp. 216 - 221, says,

> Religion is the parent of morality in the practical sense, that, when accepted by faith, it becomes the most powerful of all the motives which can be constantly operative in sustaining the moral life of individuals, by keeping the sense of a mutually felt union with the Eternal and Almighty Being ever present to the mind. (Quoted by Ten Broeke, The Moral Life and Religion, p. 183.)

ester of God. Christianity is enormously effective in the moral life because it gives to moral ideas a cosmic backing, which, in turn imparts to the moral ideas emotional intensity and spiritual quality. When man puts his trust in a morally good God, and conceives his moral consciousness as subject to and coordinate with God's will, he has created a most compelling sanction for moral conduct. His whole life, including of course his moral life, becomes religious. His ethics becomes Christian ethics.

2) Religion and ethics interact in Christianity in such fashion that the hard striving after moral perfection is transformed into a joyous experience of moral power. God, the author of the moral law, is also the helper towards its realization. When the believer puts himself humbly in fellowship with God, strains right relationally with him, he has linked his life to a never-failing source of moral power.[1] In this lineage the spectacular miracle of "grace" is wrought: the believer no longer overtaxes his moral fibres to enjoy relin-

---

1 Bradworth Hodgson, Interpretations of Experience, IV, pp. 316 - 321, says,

> Religion is the parent of morality in the practical sense, that, when accepted by faith, it becomes the most powerful of all the motives which can be constantly operative in sustaining the moral life of individuals, by keeping the sense of a mutually felt union with the Eternal and Almighty Being ever present to the mind. (Quoted by Tom Brooks, The Moral Life and Religion, p. 188.)

ship with God in meritorious terms, as something to which he has attained, but as a condition granted, a gift given by God. The Christian becomes morally creative; the concentration of all the spiritual forces in his nature produces noteworthy moral fruits.[1] The higher virtues emerge in the life of the Christian.

> The historical virtues, truthfulness and economic integrity, are the latest products of spiritual advance, the especial deposits of the Christian temper in religion.[2]

Perhaps the secret of the moral power which floods the life of the Christian lies in the assumption of Christianity that what ought to be really is. Obviously such an apparently optimistic doctrine must be dealt with guardedly. But does not Jesus' teaching assume that the Kingdom of God may become an actuality in the individual or the group the moment a vital relationship with God is formed? Christianity creates moral values through tenacious faith in the proposition that such values exist. Hocking interprets this phase of the moral creativity of Christianity in an original way:

> Human brotherhood also is an infinite problem - men have to be made brothers, and the whole of history is requisite to tell

---

1 Höffding, Philosophy of Religion, pp. 321, 338.

2 Hocking, The Meaning of God in Human Experience, p. 513.

ship with God in meritorious terms, as something to which he has attained, but as a condition created, a gift given by God. The Christian becomes *morally creative* the concentration of all the spiritual forces in his nature produces noteworthy moral fruits.[1] The higher virtues emerge in the life of the Christian.

> The historical virtues, truthfulness and economic integrity, are the latest products of spiritual advance, the especial deposits of the Christian temper in religion.[2]

Perhaps the secret of the moral power which floods the life of the Christian lies in the assumption of Christianity that what *ought to be really is*. Obviously such an apparently optimistic doctrine must be dealt with gradually. But does not Jesus' teaching assume that the Kingdom of God may become an actuality in the individual or the group the moment a vital relationship with God is formed. Christianity creates moral values through tenacious faith in the proposition that such values exist. Dodding interprets this phase of the moral creativity of Christianity in an original way:

> Human brotherhood also is an infinite process - men have to be *made* brothers, and the whole of history is requisite to that

---

1 Rattigan, *Philosophy of Religion*, p. 232, 233.

2 Hocking, *The Meaning of God in Human Experience*, p. 512.

> the tale of achieving that end: but in religion men are already brothers and experience their brotherhood in the moment of common worship. So with morality: in time my moral task will never be finished, for my imperfection is infinite and my progress by small degrees; but religion calls upon me to be perfect at once even as God is perfect, and in religion somehow I am perfect. . .Religion is anticipated attainment.[1]

The sense of moral power emanating from Christian faith is one of the most striking characteristics of the relation of religion to ethics. Chapter VII of this thesis will reveal its significance for Paul's experience.

3) Religion and ethics interact in Christianity in such a way that <u>the religious life is implemented by the moral life</u>. The natural expression of religious vitality is good conduct. Morality becomes in Christianity both condition and outcome of right relationship with God. On the one hand, the vision of God appears only to those who are morally conditioned to receive it. It is the insistent demand of the New Testament that the seeker after God be a person of genuine moral earnestness. Jesus laid down the fundamental axiom:

> Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.[2]

John's gospel declares the way to spiritual knowledge to be moral in character:

---

1 Hocking, <u>The Meaning of God in Human Experience</u>, p. 31.

2 Mt 5:8.

the task of achieving that end; but in religion man are already brothers and experience their brotherhood in the moment of common worship. So with morality: in this my moral task will never be finished, for my imperfection is infinite and my progress by small degrees; but religion calls upon me to be perfect at once even as God is perfect, and in religion somehow I am perfect. . . Religion is anticipated attainment.[1]

The sense of moral power emanating from Christian faith is one of the most striking characteristics of the relation of religion to ethics. Chapter VII of this thesis will reveal its significance for Paul's experience.

3) Religion and ethics interact in Christianity in such a way that the religious life is implemented by the moral life. The natural expression of religious vitality is good conduct. Morality becomes in Christianity both condition and outcome of right relationship with God. On the one hand, the vision of God appears only to those who are morally conditioned to receive it. It is the insistent demand of the New Testament that the seeker after God be a person of genuine moral earnestness. Jesus laid down the fundamental axiom:

> Blessed are the pure in heart; for they shall see God.[2]

John's gospel indicates the way to spiritual knowledge to be moral in character:

---

1 Hoskins, The Mission of God in Human Experience, p. 21.

2 Mt 5:8.

> If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God.[1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews confirms the emphasis,

> Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.[2]

On the other hand, moral fruits issue naturally from right relationship with God. Moral activity in the world is the natural flowering of the religious consciousness. The functions of the Christian in all human relationships exhibit the highest moral aspects. This phase of the relationship of religion and ethics within Christianity leads directly to a fourth statement concerning the relationship.

4) Religion and ethics interact in Christianity in such a way that <u>morality is applied as the test of the validity of religious experience</u>. The reverse side of Christianity's audacious claim in the sphere of moral creativity is the rigorous demand that the Christian bring forth worthy fruits. This demand has been pressed both by students of religion and religionists themselves. The standard of judgment

---

1 John 7:17.

2 Hebrews 12:14.

If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it be of God.[1]

The Epistle to the Hebrews confirms the emphasis.

Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.[2]

On the other hand, moral fruits issue naturally from right relationship with God. Moral activity in the world is the natural flowering of the religious consciousness. The functions of the Christian in all human relationships exhibit the highest moral records. This phase of the relationship of religion and ethics within Christianity leads directly to a fourth statement concerning the relationship.

4) Religion and ethics interact in Christianity in such a way that morality is applied as the test of the validity of religious experience. The reverse side of Christianity's audacious claim in the sphere of moral creativity is the vigorous demand that the Christian bring forth worthy fruits. This demand has been proved both by students of religion and religionists themselves. The standard of judgment

---

1 John 7:17

2 Hebrews 12:14

for religious experience is an ethical standard.[1] Not only is it assumed that religious persons will give evidence of high moral character, but the reverse is also assumed: where no high moral character and works are to be found, there is no true religious experience.

5) The interaction of religion and ethics within Christianity finds illustration in the mutually modifying experiences of faith and love. These terms are descriptive of the essentially religio-ethical experience of God. God, the God of love, is apprehended by faith, and the love which is of God streams through the life of the faithful. Faith and love are the inner springs of good conduct. Love is more than a virtue; as the Christian experiences it love partakes of the nature of the divine, and gathers up in itself cosmic, and therefore, invincible power. So faith is more than religious belief; it is a way of apprehending the goodness of God as that goodness reveals itself in grace and love.

---

1 Höffding, op. cit., pp. 324-325 says:

> It is characteristic of the way in which the religious problem is stated in modern times that the discussion turns more and more on the value of religion, rather than on the truth of any particular doctrines; . . the criterion of the value of religion and of its significance as an expression of spiritual culture must be ultimately an ethical one.

So also Hocking, op. cit., p. 225:

> If the experience of God does not, on the whole, enhance the attachments of human life, one must judge on these principles that the experience is not of God.

In these two simple religious terms the inseparable relationship of religion and ethics is demonstrated.

The relation of mysticism and ethics

If mysticism is one element of religion, or a type of religious experience, as this thesis contends, then what we have been saying about the relation of religion to ethics within the bounds of Christianity must likewise hold true for the relation of mysticism to ethics within the bounds of Christianity.

Outside Christianity it is possible to find an occasional instance of religious mysticism which is devoid of moral concern. Sankara, the Indian mystic (c. A. D. 800) who regarded himself as a teacher of the mysticism of the ancient Upanishad wisdom,[1] has virtually no ethic. His mysticism, says Otto,

> is not immoral, it is a-moral.[2]

But such instances are rare indeed. It might be supposed that the Indian types of mysticism would be uniformly free from ethical interest, but such is not the case. For while Brahmanic pantheism and Buddhistic nihilism alike teach the unreality of the seeming world, and preach mystical absorption as the

---

1 Otto, Mysticism East and West, p. 155.

2 Ibid, p. 207.

In these two simple religious terms the interpersonal relationship of religion and ethics is demonstrated.

The relation of mysticism and ethics

If mysticism is one element of religion, or a type of religious experience, as this thesis maintains, then what we have been saying about the relation of religion to ethics within the bounds of Christianity must likewise hold true for the relation of mysticism to ethics within the bounds of Christianity.

Outside Christianity it is possible to find an occasional instance of religious mysticism which is devoid of moral concern. Indeed, the Indian mystic (c. A. D. 800) who regarded himself as a teacher of the mysticism of the Sankhya Upanishad wrote,[1] has virtually no ethic. His mysticism, says Otto,

is not immoral, it is a-moral.[2]

But such instances are rare indeed. It might be suggested that the Indian types of mysticism would be unfairly free from ethical interest, but such is not the case. For while Brahmanic mysticism and Buddhistic nihilism alike teach the unreality of the seeming world, and preach physical abnegation as the

---

1 Otto, Mysticism East and West, p. 98.

2 Ibid., p. 207.

highest goal, thereby losing the sense of the worth of human personality,[1] the Bhagavad Gita has "an ethic of manly action."[2]

But within Christianity the relation of mystical religion to ethics is quite as real, though perhaps not always so apparent, as the relation of any other type of religion to ethics. Because mysticism has been identified (mistakenly) with so-called mystical states of consciousness, critics have often judged mysticism as non-moral, or even immoral. It may be, as Leuba points out,[3] that such states of consciousness as vision, audition, and ecstasy are not in and of themselves morally significant. But they certainly become morally significant when they are interpreted in relation to life as a whole. Among mystics of a practical type these extraordinary experiences were neither encouraged nor highly rated. Teresa, for example, herself subject to visions and ecstasies, regarded them not as essential to the mystic life, but as gifts granted by God for encouragement toward the development of higher values.[4]

Christian mysticism exhibits the interaction of

---

1 Pringle-Pattison,"Mysticism," Ency. Britt., Vol. 19, p. 123.

2 Edgerton, The Bhagavad Gita, p. 207.

3 Leuba, The Psychology of Religious Mysticism, p. 188.

4 Ibid.

highest goal, thereby lending the lesson of the words of Buddha personally,[1] the Bhagavad Gita has the ethic of manly action.[2]

But within Christianity the relation of mystical religion to ethics is quite as real, though perhaps not always so apparent, as the relation of any other type of religion to ethics. Because mysticism has been identified (mistakenly) with so-called mystical states of consciousness, critics have often judged mysticism as non-moral, or even immoral. It may be, as Inge points out,[3] that such states of consciousness as vision, audition, and ecstasy are not in and of themselves morally significant. But they certainly become morally significant when they are interpreted in relation to life as a whole. Among mystics of a practical type these extraordinary experiences were neither encouraged nor highly rated. Teresa, for example, herself subject to visions and ecstasies, regarded them not as essential to the mystic life, but as gifts granted by God for encouragement toward the development of higher values.[4]

Christian mysticism exhibits the interaction of

1/ Friedle-Pattison, "Mysticism," Ency. Relig., Vol. 19, p. 182.

2 Edgerton, The Bhagavad Gita, p. 207.

3 Inge, The Psychology of Religious Mysticism, p. 189.

4 Ibid.

religion and ethics in the same forms that we have enumerated in describing the interaction within Christianity as a whole. The mystics' experience of God was primary; their moral conduct was motivated by their religious consciousness; through immediate contact with God they experienced an influx of moral power; their mysticism was implemented by morality, and tested by it as well; their language of faith and love reveals the close interaction of the mystical and the ethical elements of religion.

No serious study of historic mysticism can avoid the conclusion that mystical experience had direct moral outcomes. Allowing for moral extravagances in asceticism and devoutness,[1] which may be marked off against the mystics, it is abundantly evident that they lived lives of moral fruitfulness. William James sums up the "values of saintliness" in these words:

> Single attributes of saintliness may, it is true, be temperamental endowments, found in non-religious individuals. But the whole group of them forms a combination which, as such, is religious, for it seems to flow from the sense of the divine as from its psychological centre. Whoever possesses strongly this sense comes naturally to think that the smallest details of this world derive infinite significance from their relation to an unseen divine order. The thought of this order yields him a superior denomination of happiness, and a stedfastness of soul with which no other can compare. In social relations his serviceability is exemplary; he abounds in impulses to help. . . Finally,

---

1 James, The Varieties of Religious Experience, pp. 343-349.

religion and ethics in the same form that we have enumerated in describing the intersection within Christianity as a whole. The mystics' experience of God was primary; their moral conduct was motivated by their religious consciousness; through immediate contact with God they experienced an influx of moral power; their mysticism was implemented by morality, and tested by it as well; their language of faith and love reveals the close intersection of the mystical and the ethical elements of religion.

No serious study of historic mysticism can avoid the conclusion that mystical experience had direct moral outcomes. Allowing for moral extravagances in asceticism and devoutness, which may be marked off against the mystics, it is abundantly evident that they lived lives of worth and faithfulness. William James sums up the "values of saintliness" in these words:

> Single attributes of saintliness may, it is true, be temperamental endowments, found in non-religious individuals. But the whole group of them form a combination which, as such, is religious, for it seems to flow from the sense of the divine as from its psychological centre. Whoever possesses strongly this sense comes naturally to think that the smallest details of this world derive infinite significance from their relation to an unseen divine order. The thought of this order yields him a superior domination of happiness, and a steadfastness of soul with which no other can compare. In social relations his serviceability is exemplary: he abounds in impulses to help. . . . Finally,

---

1 James, The Varieties of Religious Experience, pp. 243-249.

> his humble-mindedness and his ascetic tendencies save him from the petty personal pretensions which so obstruct our ordinary social intercourse, and his purity gives us in him a clean man for a companion. Felicity, purity, charity, patience, self-severity, - these are splendid excellencies, and the saint of all men shows them in the completest possible measure.[1]

From one of mysticism's sharpest critics comes this testimony to the moral activity of the mystics:

> They were not satisfied with the practice of theory in cloistered seclusion. When they felt themselves prepared, they sallied forth as apostles of this eminently social gospel and spent the remainder of their days preaching the love of the All-Father and universal brotherhood. No group of men have loved or tried to love according to a more radically social theory.[2]

---

1 Op. cit., pp. 369-370.

2 Leuba, op. cit., p. 131.

His humble-mindedness and his ascetic tendencies save him from the petty personal pretensions which so obstruct our ordinary social intercourse, and his purity gives us in him a clean man for a companion. Nobility, purity, charity, patience, self-sacrifice, - these are splendid accomplishments and the saint of all men shows them in the consummatest possible measure.[1]

From one of mysticism's sharpest critics comes this testimony to the moral nobility of the mystics:

> They were not satisfied with the practice of theory in cloistered seclusion. When they felt themselves prepared, they sallied forth in apostles of this eminently social gospel and spent the remainder of their days propagating the love of the All-Father and universal brotherhood. No group of men have lived or tried to live according to a more radically social theory.[2]

---

1. Op. cit., pp. 369-370.

2. Lamps, op. cit., p. 191.

Chapter IV

The Mystical Element in Paul:

The Damascus Experience

The mystical element in Paul

We undertake at this point the establishment of the first major point of this thesis, namely, that Paul's religious experience and teaching exhibit a clearly defined and well developed mystical element. Our plan of procedure is 1) to describe and interpret the personality of Paul, 2) to interpret the Damascus conversion, the beginning of his mystical experience, 3) to discover and study those expressions of the mystical element in his experience to be found in the records of his life and teaching, and 4) to determine precisely what kind of a mystic Paul was.

The personality of Paul

As a rule mystics possess certain personality traits which render them susceptible to and capable of mystical experience. Students of mysticism do not agree on any given set of traits, though a highly sensitized psycho-physical organism, extraordinary emotional power, and remarkable mental energy appear to be the common personal characteristics. The fundamental assumption underlying our interpretation of the mystical element in Paul of Tarsus is that he possessed a personality well adapted to mystical experience.

Paul's psycho-physical organism

For one thing, Paul's psycho-physical organism was both delicate and sensitive. Sensitive, because throughout his whole life he

The mystical element in Paul

We undertake at this point the establishment of the first major point of this thesis, namely, that Paul's religious experience and teaching exhibit a clearly defined and well developed mystical element. Our plan of procedure is 1) to describe and interpret the personality of Paul, 2) to interpret the Damascus conversion, the beginning of his mystical experience, 3) to discover and study those expressions of the mystical element in his experience to be found in the records of his life and teaching, and 4) to determine precisely what kind of a mystic Paul was.

The personality of Paul

As a rule mystics possess certain personality traits which render them susceptible to and capable of mystical experience. Students of mysticism do not agree on any given set of traits, though a highly sensitized psycho-physical organism, extraordinary emotional power, and remarkable mental energy appear to be the common personal characteristics. The fundamental assumption underlying our interpretation of the mystical element in Paul of Tarsus is that he possessed a personality well adapted to mystical experience.

Paul's psycho-physical organism

For one thing, Paul's psycho-physical organism was both delicate and sensitive. Sensitive, because throughout his whole life he

was a sufferer. No one was more conscious of his physical weakness than Paul himself. He admits that his physical presence was not impressive; some of the Christians at Corinth were unkind enough to make light of it,[1] while his more sympathetic friends at Philippi had fellowship with his affliction.[2] In the context of the report of his being carried up into the third heaven, where he heard "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter,"[3] he frankly records the presence in his life of a serious handicap which may well have been physical, or psycho-physical in its nature. Whether this weakness rendered him susceptible to the kind of physical disturbances which accompanied the Damascus experience, - loss of sight, and the temporary paralysis indicated by his falling to the ground, is difficult to determine. What the exact nature of his disability was is equally obscure. The tendency of modern psychologists to label it epilepsy or some kindred psycho-physical disorder is hardly justifiable in view of the paucity of recorded symptoms.

Paul's psycho-physical organism was not so delicate, however, as to prevent his performing the most arduous physical and mental labors. If ever man turned handicap to advantage, Paul was that man. The hardships entailed in his tireless travels,

---

1 II Cor. 10:10. 2 Phil. 4:14. 3 II Cor. 12:7-10.

was a sufferer. No one was more conscious of his physical weakness than Paul himself. He admits that his physical presence was not impressive; some of the Christians at Corinth were minded enough to make light of it,[1] while his more sympathetic friends at Philippi had fellowship with his afflictions.[2] In the context of the report of his being carried up into the third heaven, where he heard "unspeakable words which it is not lawful for a man to utter,"[3] he frankly records the presence in his life of a serious handicap which may well have been physical, or psycho-physical in its nature. Whether this weakness rendered his susceptible to the kind of physical disturbances which accompanied the Damascus experiences, - loss of sight, and the temporary paralysis indicated by his falling to the ground, is difficult to determine. What the exact nature of his disability was is equally obscure. The tendency of modern psychologists to label it epilepsy or some kindred psycho-physical disorder is hardly justifiable in view of the paucity of recorded symptoms.

Paul's psycho-physical organism was not so delicate, however, as to prevent his performing the most arduous physical and mental labors. If ever man turned handicap to advantage, Paul was that man. The hardships endured in his strenuous travels,

---

1 II Cor. 10:10. 2 Phil. 4:14. 3 II Cor. 12:7-10.

constant preaching and teaching, and ceaseless correspondence reveal his heroic self-expenditure, and suggest relentless drive and inflexible self-control. But the constant sufferings[1] which he underwent must certainly have served to increase the tension in his nervous system.

Paul's passionate nature

It is quite natural to find accompanying this high-strung psycho-physical organism a passionate nature.[2] His letters reveal great pendulum swings of emotion. His temper rose quickly, and often he vented it with abandon. At times fiery invective sprang to his lips. He could denounce offenders roundly, as in the case of the incestuous one at Corinth, whose delivery to Satan he demanded,[3] or of the false teachers among the Galatians, concerning whom he said with excessive severity,

> I would that they that unsettle you
> would even go beyond circumcision.[4]

He could plunge headlong into a tirade against lawless men.[5] In defence of his apostleship, or the integrity of his calling,[6]

---

1 II Cor. 11: 23f.

2 Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, p. 36.

3 I Cor. 5: 1-5. II Tim. 3: 3-8.

4 Gal. 5: 12.

5 I Tim. 1: 9-10.

6 Gal. 1: 11-16.

constant preaching and teaching, and careless corresponded once roused his heroic self-expenditure, and suggest relentless drive and indomitable self-control. But the constant suffering[1] which he undoubtedly must certainly have served to increase the tension in his nervous system.

Paul's passionate nature

It is quite natural to find accompanying this high-strung psycho-physical organism a passionate nature.[2] His letters reveal great penetrating energy of emotion. His temper rose quickly, and often he vented it with abandon. At times they involuntary a rang to his lips. He could denounce offenders roundly, as in the case of the incestuous one at Corinth, whose delivery to Satan he demanded,[3] or of the false teachers among the Galatians, concerning whom he said with excessive severity,

> I would that they that unsettle you would even go beyond circumcision.[4]

He could plunge headlong into a tirade against lawless men.[5] In defence of his apostleship, or the integrity of his calling,[6]

---

1. II Cor. 11: 23f.

2. Fridderer, Primitive Christianity, p. 26.

3. I Cor. 5: 1-5. II Tim. 2: 3-5.

4. Gal. 5: 12.

5. I Tim. 1: 9-10.

6. Gal. 1: 11-16.

or personal fidelity to his ministry,[1] he could speak with passionate vehemence.

These expressions of hot-headed invective and defence are matched by expressions of the utmost affection and tenderness. Wrath gives way to winsome love; severity is supplanted by sympathy. Passionate vindication of his office is followed by eagerness to make amends for wrongs unconsciously committed.[2] He longs for the well-being of his children in the gospel and is exercised in their behalf. Only one who had practiced the sweet-spirited affections of love could have written the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians. A nature so obviously capable of plumbing the heights and depths of human emotion was precisely the type fitted for mystical religious experience.

Paul's devotion and zeal

It is not surprising that so passionate a nature as Paul's should have shown itself both zealous and devoted. When native enthusiasm finds large motives, and emotional power is harnessed to some great cause, life issues in mighty zeal and intense devotion. Paul espoused with vigor every cause which claimed him.

This trait is readily discernible in his early championing of Pharisaic religion. With a zeal approximating

---

1 Gal. 2:11, II Cor. 11: 21-23. 2 II Cor. 12: 11-18.

or personal fidelity to his ministry,[1] he could speak with praiseworthy vehemence.

These expressions of hot-headed impulsive and defense are matched by expressions of the utmost affection and tenderness. Paul gives way to winsome love; severity is supplanted by gaiety. Passionate vindication of his office is followed by eagerness to make amends for wrongs unconsciously committed.[2] He longs for the well-being of his children in the gospel and is exercised in their behalf. Only one who had practiced the sweet-spirited affections of love could have written the thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians. A nature so obviously capable of plumbing the heights and depths of human emotion was precisely the type fitted for mystical religious experience.

Paul's devotion and zeal

It is not surprising that an impulsive nature as Paul's should have shown itself both zealous and devoted. When impulsive enthusiasm finds large motives, and emotional power is increased to some great cause, life issues in mighty zeal and intense devotion. Paul responded with ardor every cause which claimed him.

This trait is readily discernible in his early championing of Jewish religion. With a zeal approximating

---

1 Gal. 2:11. II Cor. 11: 21-22. 2 II Cor. 12: 11-13.

fanaticism Paul took up the cudgels against those who in any wise threatened to abate one jot or tittle of the law which, as a Pharisee, he cherished.

> Being more exceedingly zealous for the tradition of (his) fathers,[1]

he was hurt deeply by the apparent unconcern of Christians for that tradition. Sensitiveness and pride in his religious heritage drove him to persecution of those who sought to set aside the law as non-essential. So great was his zeal in persecution that witnesses reported him as

> breathing out threatening and slaughter,[2]

while he himself admits persecuting

> this Way unto death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women.[3]

But Paul the Christian was even more zealous than Paul the Pharisee. That tenacity of conviction which led him to ruthless persecution of all enemies of the law became, under the transforming power of a new loyalty, the driving power for prosecuting a world-wide enterprise. The ends of the empire were the only limits upon his unquenchable zeal for Christ. No region was too remote, no voyage too dangerous, no opposition too great for this dauntless campaigner. Neither stripes nor shipwreck could cool his ardor.[4] Whether against

---

1 Gal 1:14.

2 Acts 9:1.

3 Acts 22:3.

4 II Cor. 11:23f.

transition that took up the cudgels against Saul who is say sins threatened to sever one jot or tittle of the law which, as a Pharisee, he overlooked.

> Being more exceedingly zealous for the tradition of (his) fathers.[1]

So was Saul deeply by his apparent unconcern of Christ since for that tradition. Sensitiveness and pride in his religious heritage drove him to persecution of those who sought to set aside the law as non-essential. So great was his zeal in persecution that witnesses reported him as

> breathing out threatening and slaughter.[2]

While he himself admits persecuting

> bits Way unto death, binding and delivering into prisons both men and women.[3]

But Saul the Christian was even more zealous than Saul the Pharisee. That intensity of conviction which led him to ruthless persecution of all enemies of the law became, under the transforming power of a new loyalty, the driving power for consecrating a world-wide enterprise. The ends of the empire were the only limits upon his conquerable zeal for Christ. No region was too remote, no voyage too dangerous, no opposition too great for this dauntless campaigner. Neither stripes nor a prison could cool his ardor.[4] Neither against

---

1 Gal 1:14. 2 Acts 9:1.

3 Acts 22:5. 4 II Cor. 11:23.

principalities, powers, and world-rulers of darkness,[1] or against his own colleagues who sought to swerve him from the path of true conviction,[2] Paul was immovable. With a zeal that brooked no opposition and sought no respite this intrepid adventurer for Christ preached his gospel and reared his churches.

A personality capable of such fiery devotion was well adapted to mystical religious experience. Music is never played on slack strings. The very tautness of Paul's life suggests the possibility of such a human instrument's producing divine music.

Paul's mental energy

Paul's emotional power was matched by his mental energy. A nature so passionate, so zealous and conscientious, might be expected to lack in mental balance. Such was not the case with Paul. His mental powers were no less marked than his emotional intensity. In breadth of grasp, in depth of penetration, in power of concentration Paul's mind has no superior in the annals of early Christian history. While exceedingly broad, his mental abilities were unusually delicate and refined. He seemed to grasp truth intuitively, yet expound it with rare logic. His writings reveal an eloquence of thought as well

---

1 Eph. 6:12. 2 Gal. 2:11.

principalities, powers, and world-rulers of darkness,[1] or against his own colleagues who sought to swerve him from the path of true conviction,[2] Paul was immovable. With a zeal that brooked no opposition and sought no respite this intrepid adventurer for Christ preached his gospel and proved his character.

A personality capable of such fiery devotion was well equipped to mystical religious experiences. Music is never played on black strings. The very tenderness of Paul's life suggests the possibility of such a human instrument's producing divine music.

Paul's mental energy

Paul's emotional power was matched by his mental energy. A nature so passionate, so zealous and conscientious, might be suspected to lack in mental balance. Such was not the case with Paul. His mental powers were no less marked than his emotional intensity. In breadth of grasp, in depth of penetration, in power of concentration Paul's mind has no superior in the annals of early Christian history. While exceedingly broad, his mental abilities were unusually delicate and refined. He seemed to grasp truth intuitively, yet expound it with rare logic. His writings reveal an eloquence of thought as well

---

1. Eph. 6:12. 2. Gal. 2:11.

as of word which seems to spring less from his forensic training than from native endowment. Paul's was a strong mind; he arrived at decisions independently; he stood by convictions in the face of numerical majorities. In controversy [1] he was well-nigh irrefutable. He showed himself capable of sure analysis and clear conclusion. He could sift and weigh the evidence of experience, and take his position upon those impregnable truths which were bound to prevail. To him goes the credit for establishing the lines of primitive Christian doctrine and teaching by which both Jew and Gentile entered the Christian fellowship. With rare foresight he evolved thought patterns which made possible the participation of all classes and conditions of men in the gospel he preached. Romans and Galatians testify to the remarkable power of his insight and logic. Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians demonstrate his ability to construct imaginatively great religious conceptions. The Corinthian letters and the Pastorals reveal a capacity for close reasoning and sharp casuistry on ethical problems. On every side Paul exhibits a superior mind.

Paul's visions and revelations

One other marked personality trait must be mentioned at this juncture. Paul was occasionally subject to visions and revelations. In these experiences we may conclude that the aforementioned

---

1 Gal. 2; Acts 15.

as of word which seems to spring less from his forensic training than from native endowment. Paul's was a strong mind; he arrived at decisions independently; he stood by convictions in the face of numerical majorities. In controversy[1] he was well-nigh irrefutable. He showed himself capable of sure analysis and clear conclusion. He could sift and weigh the evidence of eyewitness, and take his position upon those impregnable truths which were bound to prevail. To him goes the credit for establishing the linen of primitive Christian doctrine and teaching by which both Jew and Gentile entered the Christian fellowship. With zero foresight he evolved those patterns which made possible the participation of all classes and conditions of men in the gospel he preached. Romans and Galatians testify to the remarkable power of his insight and logic. Ephesians, Philippians and Colossians demonstrate his ability to construct imaginatively great religious conceptions. The Corinthian letters and the Pastorals reveal a capacity for close reasoning and sharp casuistry on ethical problems. On every side Paul exhibits a superior mind.

Paul's violence and revelations

One other marked peculiarity traits must be mentioned at this juncture. Paul was occasionally subject to violence and revelations. In these instances we may conclude that the aforementioned

---

1 Gal. 2; Acts 15.

characteristics played their part. A sensitive psycho-physical organism, conditioned by strenuous living, large expenditure of nervous energy, and constant struggle with some serious handicap, enlivened by unusual mental and emotional power, was well adapted to the type of vision which Paul experienced. At the risk of triteness we emphasize this fact, so important for our thesis: Paul was the kind of person who might reasonably be expected to have extraordinary experiences.

What were these extraordinary experiences? They were relatively rare. First, of course, must be mentioned the experience of vision and audition incident to the Damascus event, which we shall discuss subsequently. In the course of his ministry the following deserve mention: the trance at Jerusalem,[1] the vision of the man of Macedonia, [2] the revelation which led him to journey from Antioch to Jerusalem for the council on Gentile freedom,[3] his vision in Corinth while lodging with Titus Justus,[4] his vision of an angel who stood by him on the voyage to Crete, and assured him of the safety of the passengers,[5] his vision of the Lord during the night at the castle in Jerusalem,[6] and the celebrated vision in

---

1 Acts 22:17.

2 Acts 16:9.

3 Gal. 2:2.

4 Acts 18:9.

5 Acts 27:23-24,34.

6 Acts 23:11.

characteristics played their part. A sensitive psycho-physical organism, conditioned by strenuous living, large expenditure of nervous energy, and constant struggle with some adversary hardship, enlivened by unusual mental and emotional power, was well adapted to the type of vision which Paul experienced. At the risk of tiresome emphasis this fact, so important for our thesis, Paul was the kind of person who might reasonably be expected to have extraordinary experiences.

What were these extraordinary experiences? They were relatively few. First, of course, must be mentioned the experience of vision and audition incident to the Damascus event, which we shall discuss subsequently. In the course of his ministry the following decisive mention: the trance at Jerusalem,[1] the vision of the man of Macedonia,[2] the revelation which led him to journey from Antioch to Jerusalem for the council on Gentile freedom,[3] his vision in Corinth while lodging with Titus Justus,[4] his vision of an angel who stood by him on the voyage to Crete, and assured him of the safety of the passengers,[5] his vision of the Lord during the night at the castle in Jerusalem,[6] and the collective vision in

---

1 Acts 22:17. 2 Acts 16:9.

3 Gal. 2:2. 4 Acts 18:9.

5 Acts 27:22-24,26. 6 Acts 23:11.

which he was carried up into the third heaven, and heard unutterable words.[1] In addition, Paul's speaking with tongues must be included in the list of his extraordinary experiences.[2]

Except for the vision mentioned in II Cor. 12:2-4, which is recorded as having happened fourteen years previously, each of the extraordinary experiences recorded above might be shown to have been preceded by preparatory incidents and experiences. We gather that Paul's visions and auditions were not capricious, inexplicable events, without reference to his daily work, but rather integral factors in the same. However, our purpose here is not to seek explanation for these curious experiences in the background of Paul's life, but rather to draw attention to the fact that he was subject to such incursions from what he regarded as the supernatural order. Since he laid claim to such immediate contacts with the divine, he deserves to be included among those who, by the nature of their personalities, may be regarded as capable of mystical experience.

Paul a religionist

All that we have said about the personality of Paul finds its significance in this most important fact: Paul was deeply religious. His devotion and zeal were directed toward religious

---

1 II Cor. 12:2-4.

2 I Cor. 14.

which he was carried up into the third heaven, and heard unutterable words.[1] In addition, Paul's speaking with tongues must be included in the list of his extraordinary experiences.[2]

Except for the vision mentioned in II Cor. 12:2-4, which is recorded as having happened fourteen years previously, each of the extraordinary experiences recorded above might be shown to have been preceded by preparatory incidents and experiences. We gather that Paul's visions and auditions were not capricious, inexplicable events, without reference to his daily work, but rather integral factors in the same. However, our purpose here is not to seek explanation for these obvious experiences in the background of Paul's life, but rather to draw attention to the fact that he was subject to such inclusions from what be regarded as the supernatural order. Since he laid claim to such immediate contacts with the divine, he deserves to be included among those who, by the nature of their personalities, may be regarded as capable of mystical experiences.

Paul's religious [illegible] All that we have said about the personality of Paul finds its significance in this most important fact: Paul was deeply religious. His devotion and zeal were directed toward religious

---

1 II Cor. 12:2-4. 2 I Cor. 14.

ends; his mental energy was employed in the solution of religious problems and the construction of a religious faith; his visions, auditions, and revelations were all religious in character. However else one might conceive the mysticism of Paul, one must, at all events, describe it as religious mysticism. By hereditary endowment, by training, Paul must be reckoned a profoundly religious person. As a Pharisee he was no less religious than as a Christian. A Pharisee of the Pharisees,[1] he early advanced in the Jewish faith beyond many of his own age among his countrymen.[2] His early training under the celebrated Gamaliel was in the straitest sect of the Pharisees,[3] and was pursued with uncompromising strictness.[4] The thoroughgoing character of that early training is revealed by his testimony to the Philippians:

> circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless.[5]

Paul's conversion from Pharisaism to Christianity was not the transformation of an irreligious man into a religious man. It was the transfer of loyalties from one religious plan to

---

1 Acts 23:6.

2 Gal 1:14.

3 Acts 26:4.

4 Acts 22:3.

5 Phil 3:5-6.

onst: his mental energy was employed in the solution of religious problems and the construction of a religious faith. His visions, conditions, and revelations were all religious in character. Moreover also one might consider the symbolism of Paul, one must, at all events, describe it as religious symbolism. By correlating experiences, by training, Paul must be regarded a profoundly religious person. As a Pharisee he was no less religious than as a Christian. A Pharisee of the Pharisees,[1] he early advanced in the Jewish faith beyond many of his own age among his compatriots.[2] His early training under the celebrated Gamaliel was in the strictest sect of the Pharisees,[3] and was pursued with correspondingly strictness.[4] The thoroughgoing character of that early training is revealed by his testimony to the Philippians:

> circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless.[5]

Paul's conversion from Pharisaism to Christianity was not the transformation of an irreligious man into a religious man. It was the transfer of loyalties from one religious plan to

---

1 Acts 23:6.

2 Gal 1:14.

3 Luke 23:6.

4 Acts 22:3.

5 Phil 3:5-6.

another. Paul's search for right relationship with God was as earnest under Judaism as under Christianity. He was basically a religious person, with a natural predisposition for religious interests and values which, when trained by the Pharisees and subsequently transformed by his Christian experience, made of him one of the authentic religious geniuses of mankind.

Into the subtler nuances of personality we cannot, with our blunt instruments and inadequate psychological technique, go far. The peculiar powers of emotion, mind, and will essential to the genius in religion, Paul possessed in remarkably high degree.

The Damascus experience

The first explicit expression of the mysticism of Paul is found in his conversion on the Damascus road. Three accounts of the conversion are recorded in the book of The Acts, 3 accounts which though differing in minor details, agree on the important elements. These three accounts are given herewith:

Acts 9:1 - 19a

> But Saul, yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and asked of him letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any there of the Way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh unto Damascus: and suddenly there shown round about him a light out of heaven: and he fell upon the earth,

another. Saul's search for right relationship with God was an earnest under Judaism as under Christianity. He was basically a religious person, with a natural predisposition for religious interests and values within, when trained by the Pharisees and subsequently transformed by his Christian experience, made of him one of the outstanding religious geniuses of mankind.

Into the subtler nuances of personality we cannot with our blunt instruments and inadequate methodological tools, go far. The peculiar powers of emotion, mind, and will essential to the genius in religion, Paul possessed in remarkably high degree.

The Damascus experience

The first explicit mentation of the experience

mystiques of Paul is found in his conversion on the Damascus road. Three accounts of the conversion are recorded in the book of the Acts, 3 accounts which though differing in minor details, agree on the important elements. Those three accounts are given herewith:

Acts 9:1 - 19a

But Saul, yet breathing threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went into the high priest, and desired of him letters to Damascus unto the synagogues, that if he found any there of the way, whether men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. And as he journeyed, it came to pass that he drew nigh unto Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light out of heaven: and he fell upon the earth,

and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: but rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men that journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing the voice, but beholding no man. And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw nothing; and they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and did neither eat nor drink.

Now there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias; and the Lord said unto him in a vision, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one named Saul, a man of Tarsus: for behold, he prayeth; and he hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hands upon him, that he might receive his sight. But Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard from many of this man, how much evil he did to thy saints at Jerusalem: and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call upon thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will show him how many things he must suffer for my name's sake. And Ananias departed, and entered into the house; and laying his hands upon him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit. And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and he arose and was baptized; and he took food and was strengthened.

Acts 22:6 - 16.

And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and drew nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and

and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: but rise, and enter into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do. And the men that journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing the voice, but beholding no man. And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw nothing: and they led him by the hand, and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without sight, and did neither eat nor drink.

Now there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias; and the Lord said unto him in a vision, Ananias. And he said, Behold, I am here, Lord. And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go to the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one named Saul, a man of Tarsus: for behold, he prayeth; and he hath seen a man named Ananias coming in, and laying his hands upon him, that he might receive his sight. But Ananias answered, Lord, I have heard from many of this man, how much evil he did to thy saints at Jerusalem: and here he hath authority from the chief priests to bind all that call upon thy name. But the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles and kings, and the children of Israel: for I will show him how many things he must suffer for my name's sake. And Ananias departed, and entered into the house; and laying his hands upon him said, Brother Saul, the Lord, even Jesus, who appeared unto thee in the way which thou camest, hath sent me, that thou mayest receive thy sight, and be filled with the Holy Spirit. And straightway there fell from his eyes as it were scales, and he received his sight; and he arose and was baptized; and he took food and was strengthened.

Acts 22:6 - 16.

And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, and drew nigh unto Damascus, about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell to the ground, and

heard a voice saying unto me, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecutest. And they that were with me behld indeed the light, but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me. And I said, What shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hand of them that were with me I came into Damascus. And one Ananias, a devout man according to the law, well reported of by all the Jews that dwelt there, came unto me, and standing by me said unto me, Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And in that very hour I looked upon him. And he said, The God of our fathers hath appointed thee to know his will, and to see the Righteous One, and to hear a voice from his mouth. For thou shalt be a witness for him unto all men of what thou hast seen and heard. And now why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on his name.

Acts 26:12 - 18.

Whereupon as I journeyed to Damascus with the authority and commission of the chief priests, at midday, O king, I saw on the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them that journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I heard a voice saying unto me in the Hebrew language, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the goad. And I said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest. But arise, and stand upon thy feet: for to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee; delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom I send thee, to open their eyes, that they may turn from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive remission of sins and an inheritance among them that are sanctified by faith in me.

These three passages constitute the major accounts of the conversion. But there are scattered through Paul's letters a number of statements which give additional testimony to the fact and the character of the experience. I Cor. 9:1 records the question,

> Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?

and in the enumeration of the appearances of the risen Jesus to the disciples, Paul includes his personal appearance to him, (I Cor. 15:8),

> . . . and last of all, as to the child untimely born, he appeared to me also.

Gal. 1:15 - 16 is commonly interpreted as referring to the Damascus experience:

> But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; . . .

as is II Cor. 4:6:

> Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

These quotations tell the story of what happened at Damascus, but before proceeding to the interpretation of the experience itself, it is necessary to discover what preparation for it Paul underwent.

These three passages constitute the major accounts of the conversion. But there are scattered through Paul's letters a number of statements which give additional testimony to the fact and the character of the experience. I Cor. 9:1 records the question,

> Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?

and in the enumeration of the appearances of the risen Jesus to the disciples, Paul includes his personal appearance to him, (I Cor. 15:8).

> . . . and last of all, as to the child untimely born, he appeared to me also.

Gal. 1:15 - 16 is commonly interpreted as referring to the Damascus experience:

> But when it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me, that I might preach him among the Gentiles; . . .

as is II Cor. 4:6:

> Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.

These quotations tell the story of what happened at Damascus, but before proceeding to the interpretation of the experience itself, it is necessary to discover what preparation for it Paul underwent.

Preparation for his Conversion

From the three accounts given in the book of The Acts one might suppose that the conversion of Paul took place not only suddenly, but unexpectedly and without reference to Paul's past experience. Such was not the case. Paul underwent a very definite preparation for his conversion, and without some understanding of that preparation, the conversion and much of Paul's subsequent life would appear highly enigmatic. Though the documentary evidence for this preparatory experience is slight, it is possible to reconstruct the psychological background against which the conversion becomes intelligible.

The first factor in this preparatory experience was Paul's knowledge of Jesus.

> For instance, the very fact of Jesus appearing to Paul in the way and convincing him that he was the Messiah and was risen from the dead, was dependent upon Paul's knowing who Jesus was and the claims that were made for him. The voice said, 'I am Jesus,' and Paul knew then without further explanation what the vision meant. He had heard all about Jesus. [1]

Though he may never have seen Jesus personally, many of Paul's contemporaries had seen and heard him, and knew both what he taught and what effects his teaching had produced among the people. Paul was undoubtedly familiar with the story of

---

1 Lowstuter, Paul, Campaigner for Christ, pp. 48-49.

Preparation for his Conversion.

From the three accounts given in the Book of The Acts one might suppose that the conversion of Saul took place not only suddenly, but unexpectedly and without reference to Saul's past experience. Such was not the case. Saul underwent a very definite preparation for his conversion, and without some understanding of that preparation, the conversion and much of Saul's subsequent life would appear mighty unlikely. Though the inscriptory evidence for this preparatory experience is slight, it is possible to reconstruct the psychological background against which the conversion becomes intelligible.

The first factor in this preparatory experience was Saul's knowledge of Jesus.

> For instance, the very fact of Jesus appearing to Saul in the way and convincing him that he was the Messiah and was risen from the dead, was dependent upon Saul's knowing who Jesus was and the claims that were made for him. The voice said, 'I am Jesus,' and Saul knew then without further explanation what the vision meant. He had heard all about Jesus. 1

Though he may never have seen Jesus personally, many of Saul's countrymen had seen and heard him, and knew both what he taught and what effects his teaching had produced among the people. Saul was undoubtedly familiar with the story of

---

1 Lowther, Saul, Commissioner for Christ, pp. 44-45.

Jesus, the principal events in his ministry, and the claims that were being made for him. He knew that men hailed him as the Messiah who had risen from the dead. These very claims constituted the ground of Jewish opposition to Jesus. The constant appeal to the name of Jesus aroused the hostility of the Jews, and caused them to bring those who ministered in that name before the Sanhedrin.[1] We dare not suppose that Paul engaged in persecution of the Christians without knowing the charges that were brought against them; such charges involved the work and ministry of Jesus. The story of Jesus and the Christian beliefs concerning him doubtless occupied a prominent place in the testimony of Christians at the hearings given them. So thoroughly conversant was Paul with the story of Jesus that when the voice spoke to him near Damascus,

> There was no need to ask who Jesus was or what he sought; Paul was fully prepared to give answer intelligently to the vision, realizing what the answer involved. From the Christians he had learned to call him 'Lord.'[2]

A second and related factor in Paul's preparation was his contact with Christians. As their persecutor Paul had ample opportunity to observe their conduct. He

---

1 Acts 4:5; 5:27.

2 Lowstuter, op. cit., p. 50.

Jesus, the religious events in his ministry and the claims that were being made for him. He knew that men hailed him as the Messiah who had risen from the dead. These very claims constituted the ground of Jewish opposition to Jesus. The sanhedrin appeal to the name of Jesus aroused the hostility of the Jews, and caused them to bring those who ministered in that name before the Sanhedrin.[1] We dare not suppose that Paul engaged in persecution of the Christians without knowing the charges that were brought against them; such charges involved the work and ministry of Jesus. The story of Jesus and the Christian beliefs concerning him doubtless occupied a prominent place in the testimony of Christians at the hearings given them. So thoroughly convergent was Paul with the story of Jesus that when the voice spoke to him near Damascus,

> There was no need to ask who Jesus was or what he sought; Paul was fully prepared to give answer intelligently to the vision, realizing what the answer involved. From the Christians he had learned to call him 'Lord.'[2]

A second and related factor in Paul's preparation was his contact with Christians. As their persecutor Paul had ample opportunity to observe their conduct. He

---

1. Acts 4:5; 5:27.

2. Bowmaker, op. cit., p. 80.

saw that their common life was blessed with a strange peace and power. In their contacts with each other they were gentle, kind, and loving. Under attack they exhibited a stedfast loyalty to conviction. Suffering could neither daunt their faith nor dampen their ardor. They were possessed of a serenity which defied fear and overcame hardship. Paul saw at least one of them put to death; indeed, he consented to the death,[1] and stood by with the garments of the witnesses at his feet.[2] The triumphant peace in which the martyr met his death could not but have affected Paul profoundly. As he compared himself with the Christians, he could not have helped speculating on the source of the marvellous peace and power which sustained them in times of persecution and death. The compelling power of Jesus was manifest in the behavior of those who had faith in him.

A third factor in Paul's preparation for the Damascus event was the unsatisfactory character of his own religious experience. In our study of the personality of Paul we saw that Paul was a religionist. The passion of his life was to find God and attain right relationship with him. As a Jew Paul had been well instructed in the grounds on which he might claim that relationship. God's promise of salvation had been given to Abraham and to his seed. The chosen people,

---

1 Acts 8:1. 2 Acts 7:58.

way that their common life was blessed with a strong peace and power. In their association with each other they were gentle, kind, and loving. Under ethnic they exhibited a steadfast loyalty to conviction. Barbarism could neither daunt their faith nor dampen their ardor. They were possessed of a serenity which dwelled fear and overcame burdensome. Paul saw at least one of them put to death. Indeed, he commended the death,[1] and stood by with the vanguards of the martyrs at his feet.[2] The triumphant reason in which the martyr met his death would not but have affected Paul profoundly. As he compared himself with the Christians, he could not have helped speculating on the source of the marvellous peace and power which sustained them in times of persecution and death. The compelling power of Jesus was manifest in the behavior of those who had faith in him.

A third factor in Paul's preparation for the Damascus event was the unsatisfactory character of his own religious experience. In our study of the personality of Paul we saw that Paul was a religionist. The passion of his life was to find God and attain right relationship with him. In a few Paul had been well instructed in the grounds on which he might claim that relationship. Good's promise of salvation had been given to Abraham and to his seed. The chosen people,

---

1 Acts cit. 2 Acts VIII.

among whom Paul numbered himself, had first claim upon God's favor. But Paul's realization of his Abrahamic descent

> was not sufficient to assure him of Jehovah's favor, nor to lift from his stricken soul the sense of guilt.[1]

Further, the law of Moses was for the Jew the divine rule of life, conformity to which guaranteed salvation. Paul was conscientious in his observance of the law; he respected it, and gave himself to it in obedience and trust. But the law failed to save him; it seemed powerless to bring him into right relationship with God, and served rather to bring him under a sense of condemnation.[2]

In contrast to his own unhappy religious state, the Christians seemed singularly blessed in their confidence in God's favor toward them. They appeared to have in their lives something which Paul felt to be lacking in his. Their religion appeared to give them a sense of peace and power which his did not yield. This consciousness of profound contrast between their success and his own failure in the religious life was the basic factor in the preparation for Paul's conversion.

---

1 Lowstuter, op. cit., p. 52.

2 Paul's struggle to attain righteousness will receive fuller treatment in Chapter VII.

among whom Saul numbered himself, had first claim upon God's favor. But Saul's realization of his Abrahamic descent

> was not sufficient to assure him of Jehovah's favor, nor to lift from his shrivelled soul the chains of exile.[1]

Further, the law of Moses was for the low the divine rule of life, conformity to which guaranteed salvation. Saul was conscientious in his observance of the law; he respected it, and gave himself to it in obedience and trust. But the law failed to save him; it seemed powerless to bring him into right relationship with God, and served rather to bring him under a sense of condemnation.[2]

In contrast to his own unhappy religious state, the Christians seemed singularly blessed in their confidence in God's favor toward them. They appeared to have in their lives something which Saul felt to be lacking in his. Their religion appeared to give them a sense of peace and power which his did not yield. This consciousness of profound contrast between their success and his own failure in the religious life was the basic factor in the preparation for Saul's conversion.

---

1 Lowthber, op. cit., p. 32.

2 Saul's struggle to attain righteousness will receive fuller treatment in Chapter VII.

The shock of re-creation

The shock of re-creation came suddenly. As Paul approached Damascus a spiritual cataclysm convulsed his soul. A blazing light, outshining in brightness the noon-day sun, flooded his spirit. The doors of his life were thrown violently ajar, and a new, commanding presence entered in. Though new, this presence was no stranger. He presented his own credentials, was his own explanation. The Jesus Paul had formerly persecuted became, as the revelation and power of God, the Christ who now saved him. A new sense of peace and power streamed through Paul's being. He was re-created. He who had been under the death-sentence of the law attained freedom in Christ.

So great was the shock of this experience that Paul fell to the ground. His over-wrought spirit, nerved for persecution, yet shaken by doubt, gave way before the shattering invasion of the divine presence which appeared to him. His sight failed, yet the vision was sure. The voice of his new Master, imparting the assurance of new life, bade him rise and seek further direction for his new religious adventure.

The central element: Paul's experience of God through Jesus Christ

Though the vision, the light, the fall to the ground, and the hearing of words which were heard by no others are extraordinary phenomena, they must be regarded as accompaniments

The shock of re-creation

The shock of re-creation came suddenly. As Paul approached Damascus a spiritual searchlight enveloped his soul. A blazing light, outshining in brightness the noon-day sun, flooded his spirit. The dross of his life were thrown violently aside, and a new, commanding presence entered in. Though he, this presence was no stranger. He recognized his own crucified, who his own salvation. The Jesus Paul had formerly persecuted became, as the revelation and power of God, the Christ who now saved him. A new sense of peace and power entered through Paul's being. He was re-created. He who had been under the death-sentence of the law attained freedom in Christ.

So great was the shock of this experience that Paul fell to the ground. His over-wrought spirit, arrived for sal-vation, yet unsatisfied by doubt, gave way before the startling invasion of the divine presence which appeared to him. The sight failed, yet the vision was sure. The voice of his new Master, imparting the assurance of new life, made his rise and speed further direction for his new religious adventure.

The central element: Paul's experience of God through Jesus Christ

Through the vision, the light, the fall to the ground, and the hearing of words which were heard by no others are extraordinary phenomena. They must be regarded as accompaniments

of the central element in Paul's conversion, - the experience of Jesus. Because many mystics in subsequent centuries have been subject to trance, vision, audition, and ligature, interpreters have been quick to fasten upon these phenomena as the essential characteristics of mysticism. In the case of Paul's conversion such interpretation is unwarranted. Granted that the accompaniments to Paul's experience of Jesus were striking and unusual, they nevertheless do not represent the essentially mystical element in his conversion. Their real importance lies in the emphasis they lend to the central element, - Paul's experience of Jesus. They did not produce that experience; rather, that experience produced them. At most they stand as a testimony to the profoundly moving character of the spiritual event to which they are related. The explanation of Paul's vision and his fall to the ground may be found in the condition of his psycho-physical organism at the time of the conversion. But the element which deserves to be called central is the personal contact established between Paul and Jesus.

The mystical element in the Damascus experience

We have defined mysticism as that type of religious experience in which the individual comes into immediate contact with the divine. In what sense can Paul's experience be

of the central element in Paul's conversion, - the experience of Jesus. Because many articles in subsequent centuries have been subject to trance, vision, audition, and illusion, interpreters have been quick to impute upon these phenomena as the essential characterization of apostleship. In the case of Paul's conversion such interpretation is unwarranted. Granted that the accompaniments to Paul's experience of Jesus were striking and unusual, they nevertheless do not constitute the essentially psychical element in his conversion. Their real importance lies in the emphasis they lead to the central element, - Paul's experience of Jesus. They did not produce that experience; rather, that experience produced them. At most they stand as a testimony to the profoundly moving character of the spiritual events to which they are related. The explanation of Paul's vision and his fall to the ground may be found in the condition of his psycho-physical organism at the time of the conversion. But one element which deserves to be called central is the personal contact established between Paul and Jesus.

The mystical element in the remarkable experience — We have defined mysticism as that type of religious experience in which the individual comes into immediate contact with the divine. In what sense can Paul's experience be

described as mystical? First, the element of immediacy is certainly present in the conversion. At Damascus, Paul came face to face with Jesus. His experience of Jesus as a person was clear, direct, real. He was speaking in personal terms with Jesus; he saw Jesus; he was conscious of the presence of Jesus. It is inadequate to say that Paul came to a belief on Jesus or a conviction about him. This he manifestly did: but there was in the experience something which vastly transcended conviction and belief. Paul experienced Jesus in personal terms; the presence of Jesus appeared to him directly, without mediation.

Second, the element of contact with the divine is also present in the conversion. Paul experienced God through Jesus. Without indicating the precise form in which he conceived Jesus to be related to God, Paul assumed that in his experience of Jesus he was also relating himself to God. The appearance of Jesus brought to Paul a new revelation of the character of God, a revelation which involved a new relationship of Paul to God. The Damascus vision

> meant for him a new conception of God, of religion, of worship, and of life. [1]

---

1 Lowstuter, op. cit., p. 63.

described as mystical. First, the element of immediacy is certainly present in the conversion. At Damascus, Paul came face to face with Jesus. His experience of Jesus as a person was clear, direct, real. He was speaking in personal terms with Jesus; he saw Jesus; he was conscious of the presence of Jesus. It is inadequate to say that Paul came to a belief on Jesus or a conviction about him. This he manifestly did; but there was in the experience something which vastly transcends conviction and belief. Paul experienced Jesus in personal terms; the presence of Jesus appeared to him directly, without mediation.

Second, the element of contact with the divine is also present in the conversion. Paul experienced God through Jesus. Without indicating the precise form in which he conceived Jesus to be related to God, Paul was aware that in his experience of Jesus he was also relating himself to God. The appearance of Jesus brought to Paul a new revelation of the character of God, a revelation which involved a new relationship of Paul to God. The Damascus vision

> meant for him a new conception of God, of religion, of worship, and of life.[1]

---

1. Bowmaker, op. cit., p. 63.

If II Cor. 4:6 may be referred to the Damascus experience we have first-hand testimony to the fact that Paul caught something of

> the light of the knowledge of the glory of God

as he gazed into

> the face of Jesus Christ.

Through Jesus Paul came into a realization of the love, mercy, and pardoning grace of God.

Paul's construction of the conversion

Paul placed three very definite and significant constructions upon his mystical experience of Jesus at Damascus. In the first place, he construed it as an appearance of Jesus quite as authentic and authoritative as those which the risen Jesus made to his disciples. Indeed, he includes the Damascus appearance as the last of the series of Jesus' resurrection appearances. After enumerating to the Corinthians the resurrection appearances which Jesus made to Cephas, the twelve, the five hundred, James, and to all the apostles Paul concludes,

> and last of all, as to the child untimely born, he appeared to me also. [1]

At another critical juncture Paul asks pointedly,

> Have I not seen the Lord Jesus? [2]

---

1 I Cor. 15:8.

2 I Cor. 9:1.

If II Cor. 4:6 may be referred to the Damascus experience we have first-hand testimony to the fact that Paul caught something of

> the light of the knowledge of the
> glory of God
>
> as he gazed into
>
> the face of Jesus Christ.

Through Jesus Paul came into a realization of the love, mercy, and pardoning grace of God.

Paul's construction of the conversion

Paul placed three very definite and significant constructions upon his mystical experience of Jesus at Damascus. In the first place, he construed it as an appearance of Jesus quite as authoritative and authoritative as those which the risen Jesus made to his disciples. Indeed, he includes the Damascus appearance as the last of the series of Jesus' resurrection appearances. After enumerating to the Corinthians the resurrection appearances which Jesus made to Cephas, the twelve, the five hundred, James, and to all the apostles Paul concludes,

> and last of all, as to the child untimely
> born, he appeared to me also. [1]

At another critical juncture Paul asks pointedly,

> Have I not seen the Lord Jesus? [2]

---

1 I Cor. 15:8. 2 I Cor. 9:1.

In the second place, Paul construed the Damascus experience as the charter of his apostleship. At Damascus he received his gospel, and was commissioned to preach. Later, in writing to those churches where his apostleship was under fire, he was careful to assert the independent character of the gospel's deliverance to him.

> For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ. [1]

Likewise, he made bold to assert the peculiar, personal, and independent character of his call to preach; the Damascus experience was for him a special "ordination."

> . . . . it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, <u>and called me</u> through his grace, to reveal his Son in me. [2]

Thus Jesus not only revealed himself to Paul, but <u>called</u> him.

As a Jew, Paul had been devoted to the service of God. His new experience of Jesus gave new direction and greater intensity to this devotion. With the appearance of Jesus came the conviction that his life belonged to and must be given in the service of his new Lord. Although there are indications in his speech before Agrippa that with his conversion he felt

---

1 Gal. 1:11 - 12. 2 Gal. 1:15 - 16.

In the second place, Paul construed the Damascus experience as the charter of his apostleship. At Damascus he received his gospel, and was commissioned to preach. Later, in writing to those churches where his apostleship was under fire, he was careful to assert the independent character of the gospel's deliverance to him.

> For I make known to you, brethren, as touching the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ. 1

Likewise, he made bold to assert the peculiar, personal, and independent character of his call to preach; the Damascus experience was for him a special "ordination."

> . . . . it was the good pleasure of God, who separated me, even from my mother's womb, and called me through his grace, to reveal his Son in me. 2

Thus Jesus not only revealed Himself to Paul, but called him.

As a Jew, Paul had been devoted to the service of God. His new experience of Jesus gave new direction and greater intensity to this devotion. With the appearance of Jesus came the conviction that his life belonged to and must be given in the service of his new Lord. Although there are indications in his record before Agrippa that with his conversion he felt

---

1 Gal. 1:11 - 12. 2 Gal. 1:15 - 16.

himself commissioned to preach to the Gentiles,[1] it is not necessary to assume that the specific mission to the Gentiles was explicitly demanded by his conversion experience. Other passages in The Acts indicate that he began his work in Jewish or mixed communities, and only later, under the pressure or guidance of developing events, ministered chiefly to the Gentiles.[2] However, his work was never exclusively among the Gentiles. But the call to his apostleship was implicit in the Damascus experience.

One significant statement from Paul's speech before Agrippa suggests a third possible construction which Paul put upon his Damascus experience. Jesus not only appointed him a witness and minister of

> the things wherein thou hast seen me,

but of

> the things wherein I will appear unto thee.[3]

Here Paul suggests that his conversion presaged <u>a continuing fellowship</u> with Jesus, out of which should come further revelations of God's will, and practical direction for his ministry. That this passage records the activities of his later

---

1 Acts 26: 17.

2 Acts 13:44 - 51; 14:2 - 7,27; cf. Gal. 2:9.

3 Acts 26:16.

himself commissioned to preach to the Gentiles.[1] It is not necessary to assume that the specific mission to the Gentiles was explicitly demanded by his conversion experience. Other passages in The Acts indicate that he began his work in Jewish or mixed communities, and only later, under the pressure or guidance of developing events, ministered directly to the Gentiles.[2] However, his work was never exclusively among the Gentiles. But the call to his apostleship was implicit in the Damascus experience.

One significant statement from Paul's speech before Agrippa suggests a third possible construction which must rest upon his Damascus experience. Jesus not only appointed him a witness and minister of

the things wherein thou hast seen me,

but of

the things wherein I will appear unto thee.[3]

Here Paul suggests that his conversion involved a continuing fellowship with Jesus, out of which should come further revelations of God's will, and practical direction for his ministry. That this passage reports the activities of his later

---

1 Acts 26: 17.

2 Acts 13:46 - 47; 14:2 - 7,27; cf. Gal. 2:9.

3 Acts 26:16.

ministry only adds to its significance; it is testimony after the fact. Throughout his entire life the person who appeared to him at Damascus was a constant indwelling presence whose spirit was in ceaseless interaction with his own. At times, it seemed to Paul as though Christ had siezed or possessed him:

> I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus. [1]
>
> It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me. [2]

This sense of being possessed by Christ is characteristic of his life-long experience. Though hardly intelligible to us, it was quite possible for Paul, since primitive psychology

> represented a man as possessed as soon as he felt within himself powers that he could not ascribe to himself...[3]

The fellowship of Paul with Jesus began at Damascus. Damascus would be incomplete without the subsequent mystical life of Paul, and his mystical life would be inexplicable without the initial appearance of Jesus to Paul at Damascus. There the personal bond was forged, and throughout the remainder

---

1 Phil. 3:12.

2 Gal. 2:20.

3 Weinel, St. Paul, the Man and His Work, p. 149.

ministry only adds to its significance; it is testimony after the fact. Throughout his entire life the person who appeared to him as Damascus was a constant indwelling presence whose equity was in ceaseless interaction with his own. At times, it seemed to Paul as though Christ had seized or possessed him:

> I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus.[1]
>
> It is no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me.[2]

This sense of being possessed by Christ is characteristic of his life-long experience. Though hardly intelligible to us, it was quite possible for Paul, since primitive psychology

> represented a man as possessed as soon as he felt within himself powers that he could not ascribe to himself...[3]

The relationship of Paul with Jesus began at Damascus. Damascus would be incomplete without the subsequent spiritual life of Paul, and his spiritual life would be inexplicable without the initial appearance of Jesus to Paul at Damascus. There the personal bond was forged, and throughout the remainder

---

1 Phil. 3:12.

2 Gal. 2:20.

3 Weinel, St. Paul, the Man and His Work, p. 148.

of Paul's life, that bond was preserved.[1]

With whom was Paul in fellowship?

Before launching a study of the mystical element in Paul's post-conversion experience two problems to which both the conversion and his later experience gave rise may be considered.

God, Christ, and the Spirit

In our discussion of the conversion experience we observed that God through Jesus entered Paul's life. In the data from the letters to which we shall later refer Paul speaks as though his experience were sometimes of God, sometimes of the Spirit, sometimes of Christ. Did he mean to distinguish three types of experience? Our answer is in the negative. True, Paul did distinguish in thought between God and Spirit, God and Christ, and Christ and the Spirit, and attributed to each different rank and function in the divine economy. But in mystical experience he made no practical distinction; the work of the three in the individual personality was one.

In many of his statements Paul uses all three names in a single statement, e.g.,

> God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts.[2]

---

1 Deissmann says, What happened at Damascus ought not to be isolated, but it should be regarded as the basal mystical experience of the religious genius. . . All that can be called Paul's Christ-mysticism is the reaction to this initial experience. Paul, pp. 130-131.

2 Gal. 4:6.

of Paul's life, that bond was preserved.[1]

With whom was Paul in fellowship?

Before launching a study of the spiritual element in Paul's post-conversion experience two problems to which both the conversion and his later experience give rise may be considered.

God, Christ, and the Spirit

In our discussion of the conversion experience we observed that God through Jesus entered Paul's life. In the data from the letters to which we shall later refer Paul speaks as though his experience were sometimes of God, sometimes of the Spirit, sometimes of Christ. Did he mean to distinguish three types of experience? Our answer is in the negative. Here, Paul did distinguish in thought between God and Spirit, God and Christ, and Christ and the Spirit, and attributed to each different work and function in the divine economy. But in mystical experience he made no practical distinction: the work of the three in the individual personality was one.

In many of his statements Paul uses all three names in a single statement, e.g.,

> God sent forth the Spirit of his Son into our hearts.[2]

---

1 Dalmedina says, that happened at Damascus ought not to be isolated, but it should be regarded as the usual mystical experience of the religious genius. . . All that can be called Paul's Christ-mysticism is the reaction to this initial experience. Paul, pp. 130-131.

2 Gal. 4:6.

Of particular interest is the occurence of the parallel phrases "the spirit of God in you," and "the Spirit of Christ in you," in a single verse.[1] Manifestly they refer to the same experience. So in Galatians Paul alludes to one experience by the two phrases "Christ liveth in me,"[2] and "if we live by the Spirit."[3] Burton summarizes:

> Historically speaking, the sending of the Son and the sending of the Spirit are distinguished in early Christian thought, most markedly in the fourth gospel, but also in Paul. The two terminologies, that of the Christ, and that of the Spirit, have also a different origin, both indeed, having their roots largely in the Old Testament, but being there and in later Jewish thought quite distinct. But in the experience of the early Christians the Christ who by his resurrection had become a spirit active in their lives, and the Spirit of God similarly active, could not be distinguished. Precisely to what extent this experiential identification of the heavenly Christ and the Spirit of God has caused a numerical identification of them as personalities is difficult to say. Apparently the apostle Paul, while clearly distinguishing Christ from God the Father (see I Cor. 8:6, Phil. 2:6-8, etc.) and less sharply distinguishing the Spirit from God (Rom. 5:5, 8:7,8,9,14,15) is not careful to distinguish the Spirit and Christ, yet never explicitly identifies them. [4]

---

1 Rom. 8:9. 2 Gal. 2:20. 3 Gal. 5:25.

4 Burton, Spirit, Soul and Flesh, pp. 189, 222. So also W. Weber, Christus - Mystik, S. 54.

Of particular interest is the convergence of the parallel phrases "the spirit of God in you," and "the spirit of Christ in you," in a single verse.[1] Manifestly they refer to the same experience. So in Galatians Paul alludes to such experience by the two phrases "Christ lives in me,"[2] and "if we live by the Spirit."[3] Burton summarizes:

> Historically speaking, the sending of the Son and the sending of the Spirit are distinguished in early Christian thought, most markedly in the Fourth gospel, but also in Paul. The two terminologies, that of the Christ, and that of the Spirit, have also a different origin, both indeed, having their roots largely in the Old Testament, but being there and in later Jewish thought quite distinct. But in the experience of the early Christians the Christ who by his resurrection had become a spirit active in their lives, and the Spirit of God similarly active, could not be distinguished. Possibly to that extent this experiential identification of the heavenly Christ and the Spirit of God has caused a numerical identification of them as personalities is difficult to say. Apparently the apostle Paul, while clearly distinguishing Christ from God the Father (see I Cor. 8:6, Phil. 2:6-8, etc.) and less clearly distinguishing the Spirit from God (Rom. 5:5, 8:7,9,9,14,15) is not careful to distinguish the Spirit and Christ, yet never explicitly identifies them.[4]

---

1 Rom. 8:9. 2 Gal. 2:20. 3 Gal. 5:25.

4 Burton, Spirit, Soul and Flesh, pp. 189, 220. So also G. Weber, Christus - Geist, S. 54.

As Paul uses the term Spirit in Romans 8 and elsewhere he employs it in the historical sense. It will be remembered that the gift of the Spirit was imparted to the disciples of Jesus on the day of Pentecost following the ascension of Jesus. The Spirit there received was distinctly the spirit of Jesus. From that time forward those who came into the Christian fellowship received the Spirit; the Spirit became a normal and integral part of Christian experience. Paul was no exception to this rule. When he entered into Damascus after his vision he was visited by Ananias, who, according to the record in Acts 9:17, was sent in order that Paul should not only receive his sight, but also be filled with the Holy Spirit.

When, therefore, Paul alludes to the work of the Spirit in himself or other believers, there is in his mind the definite, historical meaning of the term. The Spirit was for him the Spirit of Jesus. As such, its work was one with the work of Jesus.

We conclude, therefore, that for Paul God, Spirit, and Christ are one so far as their work in the experience of men is concerned. Whatever their distinctions in rank and divine nature, in function they wrought identical experiences. When we speak of Paul's experience of Christ we therefore

Paul uses the term *Spirit* in Romans 8 and elsewhere he employs it in the historical sense. It will be remembered that the gift of the Spirit was imparted to the disciples of Jesus on the day of Pentecost following the ascension of Jesus. The Spirit there received was distinctly the spirit of Jesus. From that time forward those who came into the Christian fellowship received the Spirit; the Spirit became a normal and integral part of Christian experience. Paul was no exception to this rule. When he entered into Damascus after his vision he was visited by Ananias, who, according to the record in Acts 9:17, was sent in order that Paul should not only receive his sight, but also be filled with the Holy Spirit.

When, therefore, Paul alludes to the work of the Spirit in himself or other believers, there is in his mind the definite, historical meaning of the term. The Spirit was for him the Spirit of Jesus. In much, the work was one with the work of Jesus.

We conclude, therefore, that for Paul God, Christ, and Christ are one so far as their work in the experience of man is concerned. Whatever their distinctions in rank and divine nature, in function they wrought identical experiences. Then we speak of Paul's experience of Christ we therefore

have in mind his experience of God in and through Christ.

Paul's Christ and Jesus

A related, even more important problem arises at this point. How was Paul's Christ related to the Jesus of history? Was Christ for Paul a heavenly being so far removed from the human Jesus as to be practically another personality? Not a few students of Paul answer in the affirmative. W. Wrede, for example, argues that Paul's relationship was with a heavenly power devoid of personality, a spiritual substance which he called by a great variety of names, but which cannot be identified with the historical Jesus.

We shall have to admit at the outset that Paul's primary interest was not in referring men to the Jesus of history as a figure who existed in the past, whose words and deeds they might well remember. His interest was in leading men into a mystical experience of Christ, the present available Power. And though we readily admit that these two purposes are not mutually exclusive, psychologically the difference between them is very great. For if, as we hold, Paul sought to relate men to Christ, he would not feel bound to say much about the historical life which antedated the risen life, with the result that the latter would stand out in bold relief while the former would slip into

have in mind his experience of God in and through Christ.

Paul's Christ and Jesus

A related, even more important problem arises at this point. How was Paul's Christ related to the Jesus of history? The Christ for Paul a heavenly being so far removed from the human Jesus as to be practically another personality? Not a few students of Paul answer in the affirmative. W. Wrede, for example, argues that Paul's relationship was with a heavenly power devoid of personality, a spiritual substance which be called by a great variety of names, but which cannot be identified with the historical Jesus.

We shall have to admit at the outset that Paul's primary interest was not in referring men to the Jesus of history as a figure who existed in the past, whose words and deeds they might well remember. His interest was in leading men into a mystical experience of Christ, the present available Power. And though we readily admit that these two purposes are not mutually exclusive, psychologically the difference between them is very great. For if, as we hold, Paul sought to relate men to Christ, he would not feel bound to say much about the historical life which antedated the risen life, with the result that the latter would stand out in bold relief while the former would slip into

the background of his teaching. From this point of view the absence from Paul's writings of any large body of specific data concerning the Jesus of history is not surprising. The pattern of Paul's religious teaching did not demand any biography of Jesus. Moreover, it is probable that in his first preaching among those to whom he later wrote letters, he told and retold the story of the earthly life and ministry of Jesus, so that it was not necessary to review it in his letters.

What if, as Weinel says,

> Jesus can hardly be said to have existed for him as a human being? [1]

Does that mean that Christ and Jesus are for Paul two different spiritual entities? Not at all. A strong emphasis on a living spirit does not preclude identification of that spirit with an historical personality. In II Cor. 5:16 Paul demonstrates pointedly the relation of Jesus to Christ:

> Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more.

Paul is simply saying that after the resurrection of Christ had taken place, the significant way to know him is not by memory, but by a present spiritual experience of him.

But with all his emphasis on the living, spiritual

---

1 Weinel, St. Paul, The Man and his Work, p. 314.

the background of his teaching. From this point of view the absence from Paul's writings of any large body of specific data concerning the James of history is not surprising. The pattern of Paul's religious teaching did not demand any biography of Jesus. Moreover, it is probable that in his first preaching among those to whom he later wrote letters, he told and retold the story of the earthly life and ministry of Jesus, so that it was not necessary to review it in his letters.

What if, as Weinel says,

> Jesus can hardly be said to have existed for him as a human being? [1]

Does that mean that Christ and Jesus are for Paul two different spiritual entities? Not at all. A strong emphasis on a living spirit does not preclude identification of that spirit with an historical personality. In II Cor. 5:16 Paul demonstrates pointedly the relation of Jesus to Christ:

> Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know him so no more.

Paul is simply saying that after the resurrection of Christ had taken place, the significant way to know him is not by memory, but by a present spiritual experience of him.

But with all his emphasis on the living, spiritual

---

1 Weinel, St. Paul, The Man and his Work, p. 214.

Christ, Paul did not lose the Jesus of history in the Christ of mystical experience. There is ample evidence in the letters to show that the historical aspects of Jesus' life were implicit in his thought and experience of Christ. He mentions the Davidic descent of Jesus,[1] the fact that he was born under the law,[2] his martyr confession before Pilate,[3] the conflict with the authorities which brought on his death,[4] his sufferings, crucifixion, death, and burial. He refers to the Last Supper,

> For I received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks . . . [5]

He quotes Jesus' words as authoritative on resurrection problems,[6] marital fidelity,[7] giving and receiving,[8] and the laborer's being worthy of his hire.[9] Moreover, there is evidence that Paul was influenced by the tradition of the words of Jesus: he refers to "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" as the fulfilment of the law,[10] to the attitude of non-resistance towards evil,[11] to good-will toward those

---

1 Rom. 1:3; II Tim. 2:8. 2 Gal. 4:4. 3 I Tim. 6:13.

4 I Cor. 2:8. 5 I Cor. 11:23. 6 I Thess. 4:15.

7 I Cor. 7:10. 8 Acts 20:35.

9 I Tim. 5:18, cf. Mt. 10:10, Lk. 10:7, I Cor. 9:14.

10 Gal. 5:14, cf. Mt. 19:19. 11 I Cor. 6:7, cf. Mt. 5:39.

Christ, Paul did not lose the Jesus of history in the Christ of mystical experience. There is ample evidence in the letters to show that the historical aspects of Jesus' life were implicit in his thought and experience of Christ. He mentions the Davidic descent of Jesus,[1] the fact that he was born under the law,[2] his martyr confession before Pilate,[3] the conflict with the authorities which brought on his death,[4] his sufferings, crucifixion, death, and burial. He refers to the last Supper,

> For I received of the Lord that which
> also I delivered unto you, that the
> Lord Jesus in the night in which he
> was betrayed took bread; and when he
> had given thanks . . .[5]

He quotes Jesus' words as authoritative on resurrection promises,[6] marital fidelity,[7] giving and receiving,[8] and the laborer's being worthy of his hire.[9] Moreover, there is evidence that Paul was influenced by the tradition of the words of Jesus: he refers to "thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself" as the fulfillment of the law,[10] to the attitude of non-resistance towards evil,[11] to good-will toward those

---

1. Rom. 1:3; II Tim. 2:8. 2. Gal. 4:4. 3. I Tim. 6:13.
4. I Cor. 2:6. 5. I Cor. 11:23. 6. I Thess. 4:16.
7. I Cor. 7:10. 8. Acts 20:35.
9. I Tim. 5:18, cf. Mt. 10:10, Lk. 10:7, I Cor. 9:14.
10. Gal. 5:14, cf. Mt. 19:19. 11. I Cor. 6:7, cf. Mt. 5:39.

who persecute,[1] to returning good for evil,[2] to the right attitude toward enemies,[3] to the teaching on defilement.[4]

The case for the identity of Paul's Christ with the historical Jesus is strengthened by other considerations. For example, in the Damascus experience Paul called Christ Lord, and heard a voice saying,

> I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest.

This evidence is clear enough. But even without it, Paul's personal relationship with Christ implies contact with a being who existed as an historical personality.

> Paul's vision and conversion are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus.[5]

Add to all this Paul's frequent references to the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and the conviction becomes overwhelming that in Paul's thought Jesus and Christ were one.

---

1 Rom. 12:14, cf. Mt. 5:44, Lk. 6:27-8.

2 I Cor. 4:12, Rom. 12:17, 21, cf. Mt. 5:39.

3 Rom. 12:20, cf. Mt. 5:44, Lk. 6:27.

4 Rom. 14:14, Acts 10:15, cf. Mk. 7:15.

5 J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 31. So also Köbling, Die Geistige Einwirkung der Person Jesus auf Paulus, Göttingen, 1906, S. 110; W. Weber, Christus - Mystik, S. 34; K. Deissner, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit, Leipzig, 1918, S. 88; E. Sommerlath, Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus, S. 16, 47.

who persecute,[1] to returning good for evil,[2] to the right attitude toward enemies,[3] to the teaching on defilement.[4]

The case for the identity of Paul's Christ with the historical Jesus is strengthened by other considerations. For example, in the Damascus experience Paul called Christ Lord, and heard a voice saying,

I am Jesus, whom thou persecutest.

This evidence is clear enough. But even without it, Paul's personal relationship with Christ implies contact with a being who existed as an historical personality.

> Paul's vision and conversion are psychologically inconceivable except upon the supposition that he had been actually and vividly impressed by the human personality of Jesus.[5]

Add to all this Paul's frequent references to the crucifixion, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and the conviction becomes overwhelming that in Paul's thought Jesus and Christ were one.

---

1. Rom. 12:14, cf. Mt. 5:44, Lk. 6:27-8.

2. I Cor. 4:12, Rom. 12:17, 21, cf. Mt. 5:39.

3. Rom. 12:20, cf. Mt. 5:44, Lk. 6:27.

4. Rom. 14:14, note 1Cor15, cf. Mk. 7:18.

5. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 21. So also Kähler, Die Geistige Wirklichkeit der Person Jesus auf Paulus, Göttingen, 1906, p. 110; W. Weber, Christus - Mystik, S. 54; K. Holsteer, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit, Leipzig, 1910, S. 36; A. Schweitzer, Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus, S. 16, 47.

Summary In Paul's thought, therefore, the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith were one personality. Because Paul's own religious experience, as well as the experience into which he strove to lead others, was mystical in character, it was natural, even necessary, that he should magnify the present, risen Christ. But that Christ was continuous with the historical Jesus, and carried into his eternal life all the traits, values, and accidents of the earthly experience of Jesus. Thus Paul taught that those who were in fellowship with Christ might share mystically in the experiences of Jesus.

Chapter V

The Mystical Element in Paul:

Post - Conversion Experience

Expressions of Paul's mysticism: post - conversion experience

We now proceed, under the plan outlined at the beginning of this section, to discover and study those expressions of the mystical element to be found in the records of Paul's post - conversion experience. Here we shall pursue our study successively from two points of view, - the individual and the social. In some passages Paul expresses the mystical element as the work of God in the individual, in others as the work of God in the group. Obviously Paul did not himself separate the two. We employ the division here merely as a device for study.

Mystical experience of the individual

From the first point of view four distinct types of expression are discernible, and these we shall consider in order: a) "Christ in Paul", b) "Paul in Christ", c) Participation of the individual in the experience of Christ, d) "Faith". These four types of expression are not exhaustive or exclusive. But they represent fairly the manner in which Paul described the individual's relationship to Christ, and are chosen because they appear so frequently in Paul's letters.

"Christ in Paul"

We turn now to the first group of expressions which may be gathered under the head, "Christ in Paul". A number of passages testify to the simple fact of Christ's life in Paul:

Expressions of Paul's mystical, post - conversion experience

We now proceed, under the plan outlined at the beginning of this section, to discover and study those expressions of the mystical element to be found in the records of Paul's post - conversion experience. Here we shall pursue our study successively from two points of view, - the individual and the social. In some passages Paul expresses the mystical element as the work of God in the individual, in others as the work of God in the group. Obviously Paul did not himself separate the two. We employ the division here merely as a device for study.

Mystical experience of the individual

From the first point of view four distinct types of expression are discernible, and these we shall consider in order: a) "Christ in Paul", b) "Paul in Christ", c) Participation of the individual in the experience of Christ, d) "Faith". These four types of expression are not exhaustive or exclusive, but they represent fairly the manner in which Paul described the individual's relationship to Christ, and are chosen because they appear so frequently in Paul's letters.

"Christ in Paul"

We turn now to the first group of expressions which may be gathered under the head, "Christ in Paul". A number of passages testify to the simple fact of Christ's life in Paul:

> . . . it was the good pleasure of God . . to reveal his Son in me. [1]
>
> I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus. [2]
>
> Christ liveth in me . . .[3]
>
> For me to live is Christ . . .[4]

Paul makes it clear that this relationship is realized also in the lives of those to whom he writes:

> Christ, who is our life . . .[5]
>
> Jesus Christ is in you . . . [6]
>
> The head of every man is Christ.[7]
>
> The mystery among the Gentiles, which is Christ in you, the hope of glory. [8]

Sometimes this indwelling power of the Christian is referred to as the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit:

> . . . if so be that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you . . . [9]
>
> if the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you. .[10]
>
> Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? [11]
>
> Know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, which is in you? [12]

How is this relationship of the indwelling Christ,

---

1 Gal. 1:15-16. 2 Phil. 3:12. 3 Gal. 2:20.
4 Phil. 1:21. 5 Col. 3:4. 6 II Cor. 13:5.
7 I Cor. 11:3. 8 Col. 1:27. 9 Rom. 8:9.
10 Rom. 8:11. 11 I Cor. 3:16. 12 I Cor. 6:19.

. . . It was the good pleasure of God . .
to reveal His Son in me.[1]

I am laid hold on by Christ Jesus.[2]

Christ liveth in me . . .[3]

For me to live is Christ . . .[4]

Paul makes it clear that this relationship is realized also

in the lives of those to whom he writes:

Christ, who is our life . . .[5]

Jesus Christ is in you . . .[6]

The head of every man is Christ.[7]

The mystery among the Gentiles, which
is Christ in you, the hope of glory.[8]

Sometimes this indwelling power of the Christian is referred

to as the Spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit:

. . . if so be that the Spirit of God
dwelleth in you . . .[9]

If the spirit of him that raised up
Jesus from the dead dwelleth in you. .[10]

Know ye not that ye are a temple of
God, and that the Spirit of God dwell-
eth in you?[11]

Know ye not that your body is a temple
of the Holy Spirit, which is in you?[12]

How is this relationship of the indwelling Christ,

---

1 Gal. 1:15-16. 2 Phil. 3:12. 3 Gal. 2:20.
4 Phil. 1:21. 5 Col. 3:4. 6 II Cor. 13:5.
7 I Cor. 11:3. 8 Col. 1:27. 9 Rom. 8:9.
10 Rom. 8:11. 11 I Cor. 3:16. 12 I Cor. 6:19.

(Holy Spirit, or Spirit of God) to be conceived? To say that the phrases "Christ in me," "The Spirit of God in you," et cetera, connote something mystical is not to add much to our understanding of Paul. Are we to assume that such phrases as "Christ liveth in me" and "For me to live is Christ" signify Christ's becoming Paul, supplanting Paul's own personality? Did Paul feel himself wrapt in a mystic union with God or with Christ in such a way that his spirit and God's Spirit are identical?

Such a view is modified by another group of expressions which describe not merely the existence, but the work or function of the indwelling Christ in Paul and other believers. There is nothing static about this mystical relationship. The divine presence is a leaven which is at work in individual experience. Numerous passages reflect this fact:

> Life worketh in you . . .[1]
>
> . . . that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ Jesus. . .[2]
>
> . . . striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.[3]
>
> . . .he who began a good work in you will perfect it . . .[4]

---

1 II Cor. 4:12.

2 Eph. 1:19 - 20.

3 Col. 1:29.

4 Phil. 1:6.

(Holy Spirit, or Spirit of God) to be conceivably "So say that the phrases "Christ in me," "The Spirit of God in you," et cetera, connote something mystical is not to add much to our understanding of them. Are we to assume that such phrases as "Christ lives in me" and "For me to live is Christ" signify Christ's becoming Paul, supplanting Paul's own personality? Did Paul Paul himself merge in a mystic union with God or with Christ in such a way that his spirit and God's Spirit are identical?

Such a view is modified by another group of expressions which describe not merely the existence, but the work or function of the indwelling Christ in Paul and other believers. There is nothing static about this mystical relationship. The divine presence is a leaven which is at work in individual experience. Numerous passages reflect this fact:

> Life worketh in you . . .[1]
>
> . . . that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ Jesus. . . .[2]
>
> . . . striving according to his working, which worketh in me mightily.[3]
>
> . . . he who began a good work in you will perfect it . . .[4]

---

1 II Cor. 4:12. 2 Eph. 1:19 - 20.

3 Col. 1:29. 4 Phil. 1:6.

> For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works . .[1]

Paul can be even more concrete. He is convinced that the Christ who dwells in men performs various functions. Christ speaks in him,[2] makes intercession for men,[3] helps men in prayer,[4] supplies men's needs,[5] strengthens them;[6] the word of Christ, dwelling in believers, will teach and admonish them;[7] the presence of God and of Christ is capable of directing Paul and his workers to the Thessalonians.[8]

From such expressions we see at once that we are dealing here with a dynamic mysticism. Paul is not content to experience Christ as <u>indwelling</u>, merely; in him Christ is <u>interacting</u>, playing upon his own personality, leading, directing, teaching, speaking to him and through him. It is what Christ <u>does</u> in Paul and in other believers that makes Paul's mysticism significant. Spiritual power, moral energy, mental illumination, and inner direction are characteristics of his religious experience.

Paul never takes advantage of his intimate fellowship with Christ; he never renounces personal responsibility; never

---

1 Eph. 2:10; cf. Eph. 3:7; Phil. 2:13; 3:21. 2 II Cor. 13:13.

3 Rom. 8:34. 4 Rom. 8:26. 5 Phil. 4:19.

6 Col. 1:11. 7 Col. 3:16. 8 I Thess. 3:11.

> For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus for good works . . .[1]

Paul can be even more concrete. He is convinced that the Christ who dwells in man performs various functions. Christ awakens in him,[2] makes interession for man,[3] helps man in prayer,[4] supplies man's needs,[5] strengthens them;[6] the word of Christ, dwelling in believers, will teach and admonish them;[7] the presence of God and of Christ is capable of directing Paul and his workers to the Thessalonians.[8]

From such expressions we see at once that we are dealing here with a dynamic mysticism. Paul is not content to experience Christ as <u>indwelling</u>, merely; in him Christ is <u>interacting</u>, playing upon his own personality, leading, directing, teaching, speaking to him and through him. It is what Christ <u>does</u> in Paul and in other believers that makes Paul's mysticism significant. Spiritual power, moral energy, mental illumination, and inner direction are characteristics of his religious experience.

Paul never takes advantage of his intimate fellowship with Christ; he never renounces personal responsibility; never

---

1 Eph. 2:10; cf. Eph. 4:7; Phil. 2:13; 3:21. 2 II Cor. 10:13.
3 Rom. 8:34. 4 Rom. 8:26. 5 Phil. 4:19.
6 Col. 1:11. 7 Col. 3:16. 8 I Thess. 3:11.

claims that Christ has absorbed his personality, or supplanted his own will. There is no indication of divine automatism in Paul. Though he declared,

> Christ liveth in me,[1]

he elsewhere frankly acknowledges that Christ has never wholly conquered Paul; Christ's control is partial, not complete:

> Not that I have already attained, or
> am already made perfect . . . I count
> myself not yet to have laid hold . .
> but I press on . . .[2]

That the integrity of Paul's personality is constantly safeguarded is evident here; it was preserved throughout his long experience of Christ. Even during the imprisonment days at the close of his ministry, Paul is still seeking to gain Christ.[3]

What is true for Paul's experience is likewise true of the relationship between Christ and the Christians of Paul's churches. Though Christ dwells in them,[4] Paul is in travail for his children (in the churches of Galatia)

> . . . until Christ be formed in you.[5]

Christ lives in them, yet not wholly. Paul speaks to the Ephesians concerning their future attainment to

> . . . the measure of the stature of
> the fulness of Christ.[6]

---

1 Gal. 2:20. 2 Phil. 3:12-14. 3 Phil. 3:9.

4 II Cor. 13:5. 5 Gal. 4:19. 6 Eph. 4:13.

they are to conduct themselves so as to

> . . . grow up in all things unto him,
> who is the head, even Christ. [1]

Christ is in them, as a seed in fertile ground. If they nourish the seed carefully, it will grow, blossom, and bear fruit.

Our study of this first group of expressions indicates that Paul's mysticism is characterized by a strong supernaturalism. The new "life" which dwells in Paul and in other believers, called variously Christ, the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, works there in definite and concrete ways. In all its varied functioning the personality of the individual continues active.

"Paul in Christ" The second group of expressions of the mystical element in Paul's post - conversion life comprises those statements in which Paul declares himself or believers to be "in Christ". The phrase ἐν Χριστῷ occurs 164 times in the letters of Paul. The parallel phrase ἐν τῷ πνεύματι occurs 19 times. It was through Adolph Deissmann's study of this formula[2] that the interpretation of Paul as a mystic came into being. During the forty odd years which have elapsed since the publication of his first study, Deissmann has strengthened his own interpretation,

---

1 Eph. 4:15.

2 Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu,' Marburg, 1892. In his Paul, Deissmann gives (pp. 140-141) a list of the most important contributions to the problem, numbering some 30 works in German, French and Italian.

they are to conduct themselves so as to

. . . grow up in all things unto Him,
who is the head, even Christ.[1]

Christ is in them, as a seed in fertile ground. If they nourish the seed carefully, it will grow, blossom, and bear fruit.

Our study of this first group of expressions indicates that Paul's mysticism is characterized by a strong supernaturalism. The new "life" which dwells in Paul and in other believers, called variously Christ, the Spirit, or the Spirit of God, works there in definite and concrete ways. In all its varied functioning the personality of the individual continues active.

"Paul in Christ" The second group of expressions of the mystical element in Paul's past - conversion life comprises those statements in which Paul declares himself or believers to be "in Christ". The phrase εν Χριστῳ occurs 164 times in the letters of Paul. The personal phrase εν εμοι occurs 19 times. It was through Adolph Deissmann's study of this formula[2] that the interpretation of Paul as a mystic came into being. During the forty odd years which have elapsed since the publication of his first study, Deissmann has strengthened his own interpretation.

---

1 Eph. 4:15.

2 Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu.' Marburg, 1892. In his Paul, Deissmann gives (pp. 140-141) a list of the most important contributions to the problem, numbering some 20 works in German, French and Italian.

and given impetus to added study on the part of other scholars. Today no interpreter of Paul acquainted with the history of Pauline criticism omits discussion of the ἐν Χριστῷ data.[1]

Deissmann's interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ. Without attempting to enumerate examples of Paul's use of this expression and its cognates, we may proceed to ask what is meant by them. Deissmann answers,

> This primitive Pauline watch-word 'in Christ' is meant vividly and mystically, as is the corresponding phrase, 'Christ in me.'
>
> The formula ... must be conceived as the peculiarly Pauline expression of the most intimate possible fellowship of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ.[2]

In contrast to the relationships suggested by man's being in the flesh,[3] in sin,[4] in Adam,[5] in the law,[6] in the world,[7] Paul is

---

1 Among recent works in English which give consideration to the problem are Headlam, St. Paul and Christianity, p. 87; C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 152; A. Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp. 171-2; Paul, p. 140 f., Sanday and Headlam, "Romans" (I. C. C.) pp. 160-161; W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 119; A. E. J. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, pp. 154-156; E. D. Burton, "Galatians" (I. C. C.) pp. 124,202; H. A. A. Kennedy, The Theology of the Epistles, p. 121; W. Wrede, Paul, p. 209; M. Jones, The New Testament in the Twentieth Century, p. 143; F. G. Peabody, The Apostle Paul and the Modern World, p. 176; C. H. Dodd, The Meaning of Paul for Today, p. 27; J. G. Machen, The Origin of Paul's Religion, p. 143; J. Denny, The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation, pp. 304-306.

2 Paul, p. 140. 3 Rom. 7:5, 8:8, 9. 4 I Cor. 15:17.

5 I Cor. 15:22. 6 Gal. 5:4, Rom. 2:12, 3:19. 7 Eph. 2:12.

and given impetus to added study on the part of other scholars. Today no interpreter of Paul acquainted with the history of Pauline criticism omits discussion of the *Χριστός* data.[1]

Deissmann's interpretation of the *Χριστός* data[2] stimulated attempts to enumerate examples of Paul's use of this expression and its cognates, we may proceed to see what is meant by them. Deissmann answers,

> This primitive Pauline watch-word 'in Christ' is meant vividly and mystically, as is the corresponding phrase, 'Christ in me.'
>
> The formula ... must be conceived as the peculiarly Pauline expression of the most intimate possible fellowship of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ.[3]

In contrast to the relationships suggested by man's being in the flesh,[4] in sin,[5] in Adam,[6] in the law,[7] in the world,[8] Paul is

---

1 Among recent works in English which give consideration to the problem are Harris, *St. Paul and Christianity*, p. 47; C. A. A. Scott, *Christianity According to St. Paul*, p. 1ff; A. Deissmann, *The Religious of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, pp. 177-8; *Paul*, p. 140 f. Bandy and Hastings, "Jesus" (I. C. C.) pp. 180-181; W. Morton, *The Religion and Theology of Paul*, p. 119; A. T. Robinson, *The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ*, pp. 124-126; E. B. Burton, "Relations" (I. C. C.) pp. 124,202; R. L. Kennedy, *The Theology of the Epistles*, p. 121; *Trade, Paul*, p. 209; R. Jones, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century*, p. 145; F. C. Baron, *The Apostle Paul and the Modern World*, p. 175; C. H. Dodd, *The Meaning of Paul for Today*, p. 57; A. E. Harvey, *The Christ of Paul's Religion*, p. 143; J. Denney, *The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, pp. 302-304.

2 *Paul*, p. 140. 3 Rom. 7:6, 8:6, 9. 4 1 Cor. 15:17.

5 1 Cor. 15:22. 6 Gal. 6:4, Rom. 5:12, 8:22. 7 Rom. 2:12.

in Christ. There is no conflict involved in the two phrases, "Christ in Paul" and "Paul in Christ."

> Just as the air of life, which we breathe, is 'in' us and fills us, and yet we at the same time live in this air and breathe it, so it is also with the Christ-intimacy of Paul: Christ in him, he in Christ. [1]

Deissmann holds that the preposition ἐν carries with it a local meaning: Christ is somehow the place where Paul and believers dwell. When the question is raised as to how Paul conceived the spiritual Christ, Deissmann concludes that Paul probably conceived him in terms of spirit, a spirit which possessed not a sarkic,[2] nor earthly,[3] but a spiritual body,[4] heavenly in nature,[5] consisting of divine effulgence.[6]

> He probably thought of some light, ethereal form of existence, such as he doubtless attributed to God. [7]

Deissmann's position on this point has been rather severely criticized recently by F. C. Porter of Yale.[8] Porter points out that Paul did not define Christ in terms of spirit, but rather spirit in terms of Christ. He points to the explicit statement,

> The Lord is the Spirit,[9]

---

1 Paul, p. 140. 2 I Cor. 15:35f. 3 I Cor. 15:47.

4 I Cor. 15:45. 5 I Cor. 15:47. 6 Phil. 3:21.

7 Paul, p. 142. 8 The Mind of Christ in Paul, pp. 282-3;301.

9 II Cor. 3:17.

in Christ. There is no conflict involved in the two phrases, 'Christ in Paul' and 'Paul in Christ'.

> Just as the air of life, which we
> breathe, is 'in' us and fills us,
> and yet we at the same time live
> in this air and breathe it, so it
> is also with the Christ-intimacy
> of Paul: Christ in him, he in
> Christ. [1]

Deissmann holds that the preposition *en* carries with it a *local* meaning: Christ is somehow the place where Paul and believers dwell. When the question is raised as to how Paul conceived the spiritual Christ, Deissmann concludes that Paul probably conceived him in terms of *spirit*, a spirit which possessed not a *soma*,[2] nor certainly,[3] but a spiritual body,[4] heavenly in nature,[5] consisting of divine effulgence.[6]

> He probably thought of some light,
> ethereal form of existence, such as
> he doubtless attributed to God. [7]

Deissmann's position on this point has been rather severely criticized recently by C. L. Porter of Yale.[8] Porter points out that Paul did not define Christ in terms of spirit, but rather spirit in terms of Christ. He points to the explicit statement,

> The Lord is the Spirit.[9]

---

1 *Paul*. p. 140. 2 1 Cor. 15:44. 3 1 Cor. 15:47.

4 1 Cor. 15:40. 5 1 Cor. 15:47. 6 Phil. 3:21.

7 *Paul*. p. 142. 8 *The Mind of Christ in Paul*. pp. 202-3;207.

9 2 Cor. 3:17.

as proof for his position. Porter's point seems well taken; Paul's experience was primarily of Christ and the problem of the metaphysical form of the Christ he experienced probably never entered Paul's mind. It only becomes a problem for him who begins to analyze the experience, and to reflect upon it objectively. But Deissmann cannot be pressed too far here. He admits that Paul identified Christ with the Spirit, and everywhere assumes that what made Paul's Christ-mysticism significant was not the nature of the spiritual body which Christ possessed, but the character of the person of Christ. Our position is that the illumination of the mystical element in Paul is not aided by any discussion either of the <u>local</u> meaning of the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ , or of the metaphysical nature of the person with whom he was in real fellowship. Raising such problems clouds rather than clears mysticism, thrusts back into Paul's experience riddles more difficult of solution than the original experience they are meant to clarify. Paul's mysticism is significant not for the doctrines incident to it, but for the quality of experience comprehended by it.

Psychological interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ : Weber

If recourse to metaphysical explanation of ἐν Χριστῷ leads only to greater obscurity, perhaps a psychological explanation will prove more helpful. A study of Paul's mysticism from the point of view of the psychology of religion has been made by

an proof for his position. Porter's point seems well taken: Paul's experience was primarily of Christ and the problem of the metaphysical form of the Christ he experienced probably never entered Paul's mind. It only becomes a problem for him who begins to analyze the experience, and to reflect upon it objectively. But Weissmann cannot be pressed too far here. He admits that Paul identified Christ with the spirit, and everywhere assumes that what made Paul's Christ-mysticism significant was not the nature of the spiritual body which Christ possessed, but the character of the person of Christ. Our position is that the illumination of the mystical element in Paul is not aided by any discussion either of the <u>local</u> meaning of the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ, or of the metaphysical nature of the person with whom he was in real fellowship. Raising such problems clouds rather than clears mysticism, thrusts back into Paul's experience riddles more difficult of solution than the original experiences they are meant to clarify. Paul's mysticism is significant not for the doctrines incident to it, but for the quality of experience comprehended by it.

Psychological interpretation of ἐν Χριστῷ: Weber

It resorts to metaphysical explanation of ἐν Χριστῷ leads only to greater obscurity, perhaps a mythological explanation will prove more helpful. A study of Paul's mysticism from the point of view of the mythology of religion has been made by

Wilhelm Weber.[1] Weber singles out for treatment the problem of consciousness in its relation to mysticism. He says,

> Man gerade bei starksten Aufmerken auf den Gehalt eines intensiven Erlebnisses Ort, Zeit, ja sich selber vergessen und mit seinem Ich restlos in das Erleben selber verschmelzen kann. [2]
>
> Hier gibt es einen solchen Grad von Selbstvergessenheit, dass das Ich nicht nur momentar vergessen, sondern gar nicht mehr als menschliches Ich erlebt wird. Es hat sich geweitet zu der alles umfassenden Grösse des göttlichen Bewusstseins und ist darin untergegangen. Dabei kann es sich selbst als gottgewirkt empfinden. Ob Gott erlebt? ob das menschliche Ich erlebt? - beide fliesst hier zusammen . . Die Beziehung ist nur keine discursiv - gedankliche, sondern eine intuitiv - zuständliche. [3]

In mystical experience man's consciousness is completely lost in the divine consciousness. It is impossible to tell whether God or man is the experiencing agent. This is the foundation which Weber lays, and upon it he builds his construction of the Damascus experience and ἐν Χριστῷ. As one might expect, he contends that Paul's personality is completely lost in Christ's personality.

> Das Paulinische Ich ist bei Damaskus untergegangen in dem Christus Ich. Dieses wurde als das eigene Person-Ich erlebt . . Von Damaskus an war ihm Christus fort und fort gegenwärtig.

---

1 Christus Mystik, Eine religionspsychologische Darstellung der Paulinischen Christusfrömmigkeit (1924).

2 Op. cit., S. 51. 3 Ibid, S. 52.

Wilhelm Worcester.[1] Weber sieht hier nicht für treffend the problem of consciousness in its relation to mysticism. He says,

> Man gerade bei strengsten Introversion und den Gedanke eines introvertiven Erlebnisses Ort, Zeit, Ja sich selber vergessen und mit seinem Ich restlos in das Erlebnis selber versenkenen kann.[2]

> Aber gibt es einen solchen Ort von Selbstvergessenheit, dass das Ich nicht nur momentar vergessen, sondern gar nicht mehr als memoabilisches Ich erlebt wird. Es hat sich gewendet an der Grenze unendlichen Grades des geistlichen Bewusstseins und ist darin untergegangen. Wobei kann es sich selber als geistgewirkt empfinden. Ob Gott erlebt? ob ein memoabilisches Ich erlebt? - Welche Illusion hier zu machen . . Die Mystikerin ist nur keine discursiv - rationalistische, sondern eine intuitiv - existentialistische.[3]

In mystical experience man's unconsciousness is completely lost in the divine consciousness. It is impossible to tell whether God or man is the experiencing agent. This is the foundation which Weber lays, and upon it he builds his conversion of the Germanic experience and [illegible]. As one might expect, he contends that man's personality is completely lost in Christ's personality.

> Das Zweieinigkeit Ich ist bei Tauler unterjochen in dem Christus Ich. Dieses wurde aus das eigene Person-Ich erlöst . . Von Tauler an war Ich Christus Sort und fort gegenwärtig.

---

1 Christian Weber. Eine religionspsychologische Betrachtung der Ewiglichen Christgerichtbarkeit (1932).

2 Op. cit., S. 81. 3 Ibid. S. 32.

> Christus ist an Stelle des eignenen Ich getreten. Er ist in Paulus der personbildene Faktor geworden. Wer der Herr anhängt (I Kor 6:17) ist eins mit ihm und zwar Geist, eine Person. Nicht nur bildlich ist diese Tatsache zu verstanden, sondern wirklich. Christus, der im Menschen Wohnung genommen hat, bestimmt nun all sein Handeln von innen heraus. Sein Leben, seine neue Persönlichkeit heisst jetzt Christus. Der Mensch ist im Wesen selber Christus. [1]

This is an exceedingly strong putting of the case. According to Weber Christ becomes Paul; Paul's own consciousness is lost in that of Christ; Paul's personality merges with that of Christ; εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ indicates the absorption of one personality by another.

We have already (in discussing "Christ in Paul") taken the position that the individuality of Paul is never lost in his mystical fellowship with Christ. On that position we stand. On the basis of evidence cited above we believe that Paul, though in constant interaction with Christ, was conscious of the fragmentary hold which Christ had upon him;[2] he had not yet laid hold, had not fully gained Christ.[3] The matter looks no different when we substitute "Paul in Christ" for "Christ in Paul." Both terms describe one mystical element of religious experience. The individuality of Christ could no more

---

1 Ibid, p. 57. 2 Phil. 1:23. 3 Phil. 3:13.

> Christus ist an Stelle des elementen Ich getreten. Er ist in Paulus der personbildende Wasser geworden. Vor der Herr anhängt (1 Kor 6:17) ist eins mit ihm und wer Gott. Eins werden. Licht nur Göttlich ist diese Tatsache zu verwirklichen, nicht wirklich. Christus, der im Menschen Johnny gekommen hat, bestimmt nun all sein Handeln von innen heraus. Sein Leben, seine neue Persönlichkeit besteht letzt Christus. Vor Damask ist in Wesen neither Christus. 1

This is an exceedingly strong putting of the case. According to Rudor Christ becomes Paul; Paul's own consciousness is lost in that of Christ; Paul's personality merges with that of Christ; ἐν Χριστῷ indicates the absorption of one personality by another.

We have already (in discussing "Christ in Paul") taken the position that the individuality of Paul is never lost in his mystical fellowship with Christ. On that position we stand. On the basis of evidence cited above we believe that Paul, though in constant intercourse with Christ, was conscious of the Transcendentry Self which Christ had upon him.2 He had not yet laid hold, had not fully gained Christ. 3 The matter looks no different when we substitute "Paul in Christ" for "Christ in Paul." Both terms describe one mystical element of religious experience. The individuality of Christ could no more

---

1 Ibid, p. 57. 2 Phil. 1:23. 3 Phil. 3:12.

become the individuality of Paul, than Paul could become Christ. The two personalities, though wholly capable of interacting, remain distinct. Weber's study from the point of view of the psychology of religion must be reckoned inconclusive.

Paul's experiences ἐν Χριστῷ

Traugott Schmidt, writing on the meaning of ἐν Χριστῷ makes the interesting comment that being in Christ meant for Paul not so much "Ruhen in Christus," as

> "ein Bewegt-und Getriebenwerden in einer Kraft."[1]

That is to say, the type of mystical experience signified by this phrase is one of activity and movement of a personality under the impulse of a higher power. Emil Weber suggests the same thing; those in Christ are

> im Dienst des Herrn in seiner Gewalt.[2]

Here we are moving in the line of interpretation already suggested in the treatment of the "Christ in Paul" expressions. Paul's experience ἐν Χριστῷ takes on full meaning and value as we consider what he did ἐν Χριστῷ. An examination of the letters reveals scores of functions of Paul and other believers in Christ. Paul virtually describes all his feeling, thought, and will as taking place ἐν Χριστῷ. A list of some of those functions follows: (We make no distinction in Paul's experiences

---

1 Der Leib Christi, S. 88.

2 "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu' usw." NKZ, XXXI, 1920, Heft 5.

become the individuality of Paul, then Paul could become Christ. The two personalities, though wholly capable of interacting, remain distinct. Weber's study from the point of view of the psychology of religion must be rejected inconclusively.

Paul's experiences [illegible] Christ-mysticism, writing on the meaning of [illegible] making the interesting comment that being in Christ meant for Paul not so much "Leben in Christus," as

"sich bewegt-und verinnerlichen in einer Kraft."[1]

That is to say, the type of mystical experience signified by this phrase is one of activity and movement of a personality under the leading of a higher power. Emil Weber suggests the same thing: those in Christ are

in Bewegt den Herrn in seiner Gewalt.[2]

Here we are moving in the line of interpretation already suggested in the treatment of the "Christ in Paul" expressions. Paul's experiences of [illegible] take on full meaning and value as we consider what he did of [illegible]. An examination of the letters reveals scores of functions of Paul and other believers in Christ. Paul virtually describes all his feeling, thought, and will as taking place [illegible]. A list of some of those functions follows: (We note no distinction in Paul's experiences

---

1 Der Leib Christi, S. 90.

2 "Sich Formen 'in Christo Jesu' usw." ZNW, XXII, 1920, Note 6.

between those described as "with Christ", "of Christ", "in Christ", or "through Christ".) [1]

> The believer speaks the truth in Christ (Rom. 9:1), knows and is convinced in Christ (Rom. 14:14), has a temper of mind in Christ (Phil. 2:5), exhorts in Christ (Phil. 2:1), speaks in Christ (II Cor. 2:17; 12:19), gives out his Yes or No in Christ (II Cor. 1:19), salutes in the Lord (I Cor. 16:19; Rom. 16:22), labors in the Lord (Rom. 16:3, 9, 12), labors abundantly in the Lord (I Cor. 15:58), presides in the Lord (I Thess. 5:12), has freedom in Christ Jesus (Gal. 2:4), rejoices in the Lord (Phil. 3:1; 4:4, 10), has hope in the Lord Jesus (Phil. 2:19; I Thess. 1:3), has confidence in the Lord (Phil. 2:24), is weak in Christ (II Cor. 13:1), has power in the Lord (Phil. 4:13), stands fast in the Lord (Phil. 4:1), becomes rich in Christ Jesus (I Cor. 1:5), glories in Christ Jesus (I Cor. 15:31; Rom. 15:17; Phil. 1:26; 3:3), is wise in Christ (I Cor. 4:10), is kept safe in Christ (Rom. 16:10), has love in Christ (I Cor. 16:24; Rom. 16:8), receives a person in Christ Jesus (Rom. 16:2; Phil, 2:29), is of one mind in Christ (Phil. 4:2), has confidence in a person in the Lord (Gal. 5:10; Phil. 1:14), marries in the Lord (I Cor. 7:39); Paul's bonds become manifest in the Lord (Phil. 1:13). [2]

After enumerating these functions of the man in Christ, Schweitzer says,

---

1 Cf. Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, pp. 176 - 177.

2 A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 124 - 125.

between these conditions as "with Christ", "for Christ", "in Christ", or "through Christ".) 1

> The believer speaks the truth in Christ (Rom. 9:1). Known and is convinced in Christ (Rom. 14:14). Has a temper of mind in Christ (Phil. 2:5). exports in Christ (Phil. 2:1). speaks in Christ (II Cor. 2:17; 12:19). given out his lee or in Christ (II Cor. 1:19). quickens in the Lord (I Cor. 10:19; Rom. 16:22). labors in the Lord (Rom. 16:8, 9, 12). labors abundantly in the Lord (I Cor. 15:58). presides in the Lord (I Thess. 5:12). has freedom in Christ Jesus (Gal. 2:4). rejoices in the Lord (Phil. 3:1; 4:4, 10). has hope in the Lord Jesus (Phil. 2:19; I Thess. 1:3). has confidence in the Lord (Phil. 2:24). is weak in Christ (II Cor. 13:4). has power in the Lord (Phil. 4:13). stands fast in the Lord (Phil. 4:1). becomes rich in Christ Jesus (I Cor. 1:5). glories in Christ Jesus (I Cor. 15:31; Rom. 15:17; Phil. 1:26; 3:3). is wise in Christ (I Cor. 4:10). is kept safe in Christ (Rom. 16:10). has love in Christ (I Cor. 16:24; Rom. 16:5). receives a person in Christ Jesus (Rom. 16:2; Phil. 2:29). is of one mind in Christ (Phil. 4:2). has confidence in a person in the Lord (Gal. 5:10; Phil. 1:14). serves in the Lord (I Cor. 7:39); Paul's bonds become manifest in the Lord (Phil. 1:13). 2

After enumerating these functions of the man in Christ, Schweitzer says,

---

1 Cf. Tolsgaard, The Position of Jesus and the Death of Paul, pp. 176 - 177.

2 A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, pp. 124 - 125.

> Though the expression has thus almost the character of a formula, it is no mere formula for Paul. For him every manifestation of the life of the baptized man is conditioned by his being in Christ. Grafted into the corporeity of Christ, he loses his creatively individual existence and his natural personality. Henceforth he is only a form of the manifestation of the personality of Jesus Christ, which dominates that corporeity.[1]

In describing the way in which Paul speaks of the Galatians as one person in Christ,[2] Schweitzer observes,

> . . . they, with one another and with Christ, form a joint personality in which the peculiarities of the individuals . . . have no longer any validity.[3]

Schweitzer's view that the baptized man, when "grafted into the corporeity of Christ, . . . loses his creatively individual existence and his natural personality," obviously destroys the integrity of personality of those who are in mystic fellowship with Christ. It is difficult to believe that Paul ever conceived human individuality to be lost through mystical relationship to Christ. The moral exhortations of Paul's letters imply that his readers were in full possession of their own powers. It is more reasonable to suppose that Paul conceived mystic fellowship with Christ as a stimulus to the exercise of the natural human faculties. Schweitzer's conception of "joint personality"

---

1 Op. cit., p. 125.

2 Gal 3:28.

3 Op. cit., p. 118.

is inexplicable from the psychological point of view.

Hence, for the extreme views advocated by Wilhelm Weber and Schweitzer we substitute a normal type of interpretation.

Paul's being in Christ is best understood as a personal relationship through which impulses are felt, ideas received, new habits established, new efforts begun, new directions followed. Ernst Sommerlath expresses it thus:

> Will man dieses Verhältnis zwischen dem Auferstandenen und der Gemeinde Mystik nenne, so handelt es sich jedenfalls um "Persönlichkeitsmystik," d.h. um ein Verhältnis zwischen Person und Person. Und mit "Persönlichkeitsmystik" haben wir es deshalb bei Paulus zu tun, weil diese Mystik "Geschichtsmystik" ist. [1]

"Personality - Mysticism" is precisely what we discern in the experience of Paul in Christ and Christ in Paul. Its active, dynamic character is revealed in the variety of functions which it enables Paul and believers to perform.

Participation in the experiences of Christ

In addition to the expressions of Paul's mysticism which we have considered under the heads, "Christ in Paul," and "Paul in Christ," there is a third group in which Paul speaks of participation in the experiences of Christ. This group of expressions, which we

---

1 Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus, S. 71

is inexplicable from the mythological point of view.

Hence, for the extreme views advocated by Wilhelm Reder and Schweitzer we substitute a normal type of interpretation.

Faust's being in Christ is best understood as a personal relationship through which impulses are felt, ideas received, new habits established, new efforts begun, new directions followed. Ernst Sommerlath expresses it thus:

> Will man diesen Verhältnis zwischen dem Christusleben und dem Gläubigen Mystik nennen, so bezeichnet es sich lediglich um "Christlichmystik," d.h. um ein Verhältnis zwischen Christus und Christen. Und mit "Christlichmystik" haben wir es ebenfalls bei Paulus zu tun, weil diese Mystik "Geschichtsmystik" ist. 1

"Personality - Mysticism" is precisely what we discern in the experience of Paul in Christ and Christ in Paul. Its motive, dynamic character is revealed in the variety of functions which it enables Paul and delivers to perform.

Participation in the experiences of Christ

In addition to the expressions of Paul's mysticism which we have considered under the heads, "Christ in Paul," and "Paul in Christ," there is a third group in which Paul speaks of participation in the experiences of Christ. This group of expressions, which we

---

1 Der Grundzug des ganzen Lebens Jesu Christus, S. 71

shall enumerate presently, emphasizes the personal character of Paul's mysticism. Paul and believers do not lose themselves in the All, or the Absolute, or in Pure Being; they have a conscious rapport with a Person - a Person, who, though now divested of his earthly habiliments, retains in his personality characteristics revealed in his earthly life. When Sommerlath speaks of "Geschichtsmystik," he touches a vital point; Paul's mysticism is personal in that it is historical; all that happened to the Jesus of history is regarded by Paul as conditioning the heavenly Christ with whom he and believers are in fellowship. As such, Paul's Christ is the historical Jesus who suffered, was crucified, died, was buried, and rose again; a Christ whose present life may be shared by the believers' participation in these experiences.[1]

Thus Paul speaks of participation in the sufferings of Christ: he himself strives to know the fellowship of Christ's sufferings;[2] his personal sufferings for the Colossions' sake are a cause for rejoicing; through them he fills up on his part that which is lacking in the afflictions of Christ;[3]

---

1 Deissmann holds:

> Mystical communion with the Spirit-Christ transforms all that we call the 'historical' Christ, all that found its climax on Golgotha, all that had been entrusted to the Apostle as tradition about Jesus, into a present reality. Paul, p. 143.

2 Phil. 3:10.

3 Col. 1:24.

He urges the Romans to claim their place in God's family and to receive their inheritance by suffering with Christ; [1] he bears on his body the marks of the Lord Jesus.[2]

Paul and believers participate in the crucifixion of Christ:

> But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world. [3]
>
> They that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof. [4]
>
> I have been crucified with Christ. [5]
>
> Our old man was crucified with him. [6]

Likewise they participate in the death of Christ:

> All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death . . We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death . . . We have become united with him in the likeness of his death. . .[7]
>
> If we died with Christ . . .[8]
>
> Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin . . 9
>
> Having been buried with him in baptism..[10]
>
> And you being dead . . .[11]

---

1 Rom. 8:17. 2 Gal. 6:17. 3 Gal. 6:14. 4 Gal. 5:24.

5 Gal. 2:20. 6 Rom. 6:6. 7 Rom. 6:3-6. 8 Rom. 6:8.

9 Rom. 6:11. 10 Col. 2:12. 11 Col. 2:13.

He urges the Romans to claim their place in God's family and to receive their inheritance by suffering with Christ; [1] he bears in his body the marks of the Lord Jesus.[2]

Paul also believes participate in the crucifixion of Christ:

> But far be it from me to glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ, through which the world hath been crucified unto me, and I unto the world. [3]
>
> They that are of Christ Jesus have crucified the flesh with the passions and lusts thereof. [4]
>
> I have been crucified with Christ. [5]
>
> Our old man was crucified with him. [6]

Likewise they participate in the death of Christ:

> All we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death . . .
> We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death . . .
> We have become united with him in the likeness of his death. . . [7]
>
> If we died with Christ . . . [8]
>
> Even so reckon ye also yourselves to be dead unto sin . . . [9]
>
> Having been buried with him in baptism..[10]
>
> And you being dead . . . [11]

---

1 Rom. 8:17. 2 Gal. 6:17. 3 Gal. 6:14. 4 Gal. 5:24.
5 Gal. 2:20. 6 Rom. 6:6. 7 Rom. 6:3-5. 8 Rom. 6:8.
9 Rom. 6:11. 10 Col. 2:12. 11 Col. 2:13.

> Being conformed unto his death . . [1]

Paul dies daily, and has the marks of the dying of Christ. [2]

> If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world . . [3]

Paul and believers participate in the <u>resurrection and life</u> of Christ:

> Like as Christ was raised from the dead. . . so we also might walk in newness of life . . We shall be also in the likeness of his resurrection. . [4]
>
> We shall also live with him . . [5]
>
> Reckon yourselves . . alive unto God in Christ Jesus. [6]
>
> You . . did he make alive together with him . . [7]
>
> Knowing that he that raised up the Lord Jesus shall raise up us also with Christ . . [8]
>
> That I may know the power of his resurrection . . if by any means I may attain unto the resurrection from the dead. [9]
>
> If ye then were raised with Christ. [10]
>
> God . . made us alive together with Christ, and raised us up with him. [11]

---

1 Phil. 3:10. 2 II Cor. 4:10-11; 5:15; Gal. 2:19.

3 Col. 2:20; 3:3; II Tim. 2:11. 4 Rom. 6:4-5. 5 Rom. 6:8.

6 Rom. 6:11. 7 Col. 2:12. 8 II Cor. 4:14.

9 Phil. 3:11. 10 Col. 3:1. 11 Eph. 2:4-6.

This so-called "passion-mysticism" of Paul is extremely difficult to interpret. How Paul conceived the risen Christ still to be undergoing crucifixion and suffering, how he conceived Christians to be participating in these experiences, we are not told. The literal interpretation of Schweitzer, by which these statements are construed as indicating the inducting or grafting of believers into a quasi-physical corporeity called the body of Christ, overlooks the metaphorical character of Paul's mystical utterances. Paul's flexibility of expression is demonstrated in his varied use of the time element, for example. Thus in Gal. 2:20 and 6:14 he conceives his participation in the death of Christ already to have transpired; in I Cor. 15:31 he speaks as though it occured daily. Or, concerning the participation of believers in the resurrection, he assumes in Col. 3:1, 2:12; Eph. 2:4-6, that it has taken place; they have been raised; but in Rom. 6:11 the resurrection is a present experience; while in Rom. 6:4-5,8, II Cor. 4:14, Phil. 3:11 it is regarded as a future event.

Paul used these expressions connoting participation in the passion experiences of Christ purposefully. He employed them as ideal sanctions for religious activity; he invoked through them the highest authority for the conduct of life along ethical lines. These experiences, and Paul's appeal to believers' participation in them, served as foils for his

This so-called "passion-mystical" of Paul is extremely difficult to interpret. How Paul even-even the risen Christ still to be undergoing crucifixion and suffering, how he conceived Christians to be participating in these experiences, we are not told. The literal interpretation of Schweitzer, by which these statements are construed as implicating the indwelling or presence of believers into a quasi-physical corporeity called the body of Christ, overlooks the metaphorical character of Paul's mystical utterances. Paul's flexibility of expression is demonstrated in his varied use of the time element, for example. Thus in Gal. 2:20 and 6:14 he conceives his participation in the death of Christ already to have transpired; in 1 Cor. 15:31 he speaks as though it occurs daily. Or, concerning the participation of believers in the resurrection, he assumes in Col. 3:1, 3:12; Eph. 2:4-6, that it has taken place; they have been raised; but in Rom. 6:11 the resurrection is a present or future hope; while in Rom. 6:4-5, II Cor. 4:14, Phil. 3:11 it is regarded as a future event.

Paul used these expressions connoting participation in the passion experiences of Christ purposefully. He employed them as ideal sanctions for religious activity; he invoked through them the highest authority for the conduct of life along ethical lines. These experiences, said Paul's mystical believers' participation in them, served as goals for the

moral teaching. Thus the crucifixion and death of Christ served him well as means of declaring the freedom of believers from sin,[1] from the body,[2] the flesh,[3] and the law.[4]

We conclude therefore that these unique expressions were employed by Paul imaginatively, not literally; that through the power of creative imagination he construed experiences of suffering on the part of believers as participation in the sufferings of Christ; that he sought to join his readers in a mystical and imaginative participation in the death and resurrection of Jesus to the end that they might live lives worthy of him.

πίστις Paul used one other term to express the mystical element in his religious experience - πίστις. This term, quite the most characteristic of Pauline religion, is used by Paul to express

> the acceptance of the gospel message concerning Jesus Christ, and the committal of one's self for salvation to him, or to God as revealed in him.[5]

That πίστις as Paul employed it involved vastly more than mere intellectual assent to or acceptance of a dogmatic proposition

---

1 Rom. 7:7,9. 2 Rom. 8:10, 13.

3 Rom. 8:6, 7. 4 Rom. 6:14; 7:4, 6.

5 Burton, "Galatians," (I. C. C.) p. 482.

moral teachings. Thus the crucifixion and death of Christ served him well as means of designing the freedom of believers from sin,[1] from the body,[2] the flesh,[3] and the law.[4]

We conclude therefore that these unique expressions were employed by Paul imaginatively, not literally; that through the power of creative imagination he construed experiences of suffering on the part of believers as participation in the sufferings of Christ; that he sought to join his readers in a mystical and imaginative participation in the death and resurrection of Jesus to the end that they might live lives worthy of him.

Finally, Paul used one other term to express the mystical element in his religious experience. This term, quite the most characteristic of Pauline religion, is used by Paul to express

> the acceptance of the gospel message concerning Jesus Christ, and the committal of one's self for salvation to him, or to God as revealed in him.[5]

That term as Paul employed it involved vastly more than mere intellectual assent to or acceptance of a dogmatic proposition

---

1 Rom. 7:7,8.

2 Rom. 8:10, 13.

3 Rom. 8:6, 7.

4 Rom. 6:14; 7:4, 6.

5 Burton, "Galatians," (I.C.C.) p. 422.

is clearly indicated by his various uses of the term. "Faith in Christ Jesus" as used in Gal. 3:26, 5:6, Col. 1:4, 2:5, Eph. 1:15, I Tim. 1:4, 3:13, II Tim. 1:13, 3:15, and " to believe in Christ Jesus" as used in Gal. 2:16, Phil. 1:29, Eph. 1:13, designate a personal relationship between Christ and the believer. Deissmann contends that to construe faith as "belief on Christ"

> obliterates a characteristic feature on one of the most important points. Faith is in Paul's usage faith 'in' Christ, that is to say, faith is something which is accomplished in union of life with the spiritual Christ. .[1]
>
> Faith as Paul used the term is not a conviction reached by reason, but something practical, an inner personal dependence, an attitude of the personality, and inner bearing. Thus Paul's conception of faith is to be transferred out of the sphere of dogma into that of mysticism. [2]

Burton, in a word-study which reviews the various New Testament meanings of faith, corroborates this interpretation:

> On the one hand, he (Paul) conceived of faith in Christ as issuing in a vital fellowship of the believer with Christ, by which Christ becomes the compelling and controlling force in the believer's moral life. (Gal. 2:20, 5:6) [3]
>
> To Paul . . we doubtless owe the conception of faith as creating a

---

1 Deissmann, Paul, p. 162. 2 Ibid, p. 165.

3 Burton, "Galatians," (I. C. C.) p. 484.

is clearly indicated by his various uses of the term. "Faith in Christ Jesus" is used in Gal. 2:16, 3:26, Col. 1:4, 2:5, Eph. 1:15, 1 Tim. 1:4, 3:13, 2 Tim. 1:13, 3:15, and "to believe in Christ Jesus" is used in Gal. 2:16, Phil. 1:29, Eph. 1:12, designate a personal relationship between Christ and the believer. Dalmann contends that to countrue faith as "belief on Christ"

> obliterates a characteristic feature on one of the most important points. Faith is in Paul's usage faith in Christ, that is to say, faith is something which is accomplished in union of life with the spiritual Christ. 1

Faith as Paul used the term is not a conviction reached by reason, but something practical, an inner personal independence, an attitude of the personality, and inner bearing. Thus Paul's conception of faith is to be transferred out of the sphere of dogma into that of mysticism. 2

Burton, in a word-study which reviews the various New Testament meanings of faith, corroborates this interpretation:

> On the one hand, he (Paul) conceives of faith in Christ as leading in a vital fellowship of the believer with Christ, by which Christ becomes the commanding and controlling force in the believer's moral life. (Gal. 2:20, 5:6) 3
>
> So Paul . . we distinguish one the conception of faith as creating a

---

1 Dalmann, Paul, p. 102. 2 Ibid., p. 150.

3 Burton, "Galatians," (I. C. C.) p. 464.

mystical union with Christ . . .[1]

We gain some insight into Paul's experience of faith when we relate it to his conception of God's grace. χάρις - "favor toward men contrary to their desert", [2] is no mere attribute of God conceived in static terms; it is the conscious attitude of God toward man, a spiritual force which operates continually, the impact of which the believer constantly feels, and to which he reacts and responds. This experience of reaction and response Paul calls faith. χάρις and πίστις are the objective and subjective aspects of one religious experience.

> 'Aus Glauben' und 'aus Gnade' sind dem Paulus correlat-Begriffe; der Glaube hat ohne dis primäre Erfahrung keine selbstständige Bedeutung. [3]

Through God's grace the personality of Christ came into contact with the personality of Paul. The experience by which Paul embraced God's love through Christ is given the name faith.

> The moral energy of man which going forth to meet the 'grace' of God in

---

1 Ibid, p. 485. So also W. Weber, Christus Mystik, S. 82-3, Der Glaube ist die Verbindung der Gläubige mit Christus . . Er bezeichnet das pneumatische Leben überhaupt.

2 Burton, op. cit., p. 424.

3 W. Weber, Christus Mystik, S. 79.

> Jesus Christ establishes a mystical union in this sense is faith. [1]

This response to grace which Paul designates faith acquires variety of content and meaning in relation to the various forms under which Paul conceives salvation to be offered through Christ. Paul's speculative conceptions, - justification, sanctification, adoption, et cetera, are terms applied to varied developments of the mystical experience of faith.

Paul's faith connotes nothing essentially different from the type of experience he describes by the first three groups of mystical terms, "Christ in Paul," "Paul in Christ," and terms suggesting participation in the experience of Christ. Paul would willingly have applied to the religious experience he describes by these phrases the other name of faith. But faith is a more inclusive term.

Thus faith for Paul is the mystic experience by which God's grace is apprehended and embraced, an experience in which man and God, through Christ, are bound in intimate fellowship. Faith is the thrust of the whole life, not of the intellect only, toward God; an experience involving the personal commitment of thought, will, and feeling to God. Paul's

---

1 C. A. A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 109.

Some Christ establishes a mystical union in this sense is faith. 1

This reminds to terms which Paul designates faith somewhat variety of content and meaning in relation to the various forms under which Paul conceives salvation to be offered through Christ. Paul's apocalyptic conceptions, - justification, sanctification, adoption, et cetera, are terms applied to various developments of the mystical consciousness of faith.

Paul's faith connotes nothing essentially different from the type of experience he describes by the first three groups of mystical terms, "Christ in Paul," "Paul in Christ," and terms suggesting participation in the experiences of Christ. Paul would willingly have applied to the religious experience he describes by these phrases the other meaning of faith. But faith is a more inclusive term.

Thus faith for Paul is the mystic experience by which God's grace is apprehended and appropriated, an experience in which man and God, through Christ, are bound in intimate fellowship. Faith is the pursuit of the whole life, not of the intellect only, toward God; an experience involving the personal consciousness of thought, will, and feeling to God. Paul's

---

1 G. A. A. Scott, Christianity according to St. Paul, p. 109.

faith takes on meaning as his activities are referred to it; all that Christ does in Paul or Paul does in Christ is done in or through faith. Faith enables Paul to act; it generates moral power and spiritual energy.

We have now reviewed the four principal modes of expression of Paul's mysticism, regarded from the individual point of view: "Christ in Paul," "Paul in Christ," terms referring to participation in the experiences of Christ, and "faith". These four groups of expressions reveal certain characteristics of Paul's mysticism:

1) It is mysticism of personal relationship, in which the personalities of both Paul and Christ never lose their respective identities. The Christ with whom Paul has fellowship possesses the personal traits of Jesus of Nazareth; Christ's personality is conditioned by the historical events of his earthly life, particularly by his suffering, death, and resurrection. The Paul in whom Christ works with such power is a distinct personality, never losing the individuality which belongs to it. Neither becomes the other, nor absorbs the other. Just as one human friend influences another by his words and acts, so Christ influenced Paul. Those experiences in which Paul is consciously aware of the impact of this other personality we view as mystical; to them Paul attached great significance, and for them he found

faith takes on meaning as his activities are referred to it: all that Christ does in Paul or Paul does in Christ is done in or through faith. Faith enables Paul to act: it generates moral power and spiritual energy.

We have now reviewed the four principal modes of expression of Paul's mysticism, regarded from the individual point of view: "Christ in Paul," "Paul in Christ," terms referring to participation in the consciousness of Christ and "faith". These four groups of expressions reveal certain characteristics of Paul's mysticism:

1) It is mysticism of personal relationship, in which the personalities of both Paul and Christ never lose their respective identities. The Christ with whom Paul has faithfully possesses the personal traits of Jesus of Nazareth; Christ's personality is conditioned by the historical events of his earthly life, particularly by his suffering, death, and resurrection. The Paul in whom Christ works with such power is a distinct personality, never losing the individuality which belongs to it. Neither becomes the other, nor absorbs the other. Just as one human friend influences another by his words and acts, so Christ influenced Paul. These correlations in which Paul is consciously aware of the impact of his other personality we view as mystical; to them Paul attached great significance, and for them he found

new and original forms of expression. The mystical relation is one of interaction, not identity. Paul possessed a vivid sense of the impact of Christ's personality upon him, and its work in and through him.

2) Paul's mystical experience of Christ was dynamic in character. His contact with Christ brought moral power and spiritual energy into his life. Paul's mysticism never is content to rest in mystic contemplation or rapture; it never stops at the enjoyment of spiritual consolations. Rich meaning is brought to his mystical experience by recognition of what it enabled him to do. Working from within as the commanding impulse of his being, Christ took charge of Paul, ordered his activities, inspired his labors, strengthened his will, illuminated his mind, directed his journeys, softened his heart toward the unruly, gave him boldness, taught him contentment, delivered power to him. All these functions belong to the Paul in Christ, the Christ in Paul. Without inner dependence upon Christ we can not conceive how these astonishing testimonies, or the experiences they represent, could have been possible. Like a revolving armature in a dynamo, the personality of Christ worked in the magnetic field of Paul's moral and spiritual consciousness, generating a power which was Paul's own, yet not his own; a power which Paul loved to call

The power of Christ unto salvation. [1]

---

1 Rom. 1:16.

new and original form of expression. The mystical relation is one of interaction, not identity. Paul possessed a vivid sense of the impact of Christ's personality upon him, and its work in and through him.

3) Paul's mystical experience of Christ was dynamic in character. His contact with Christ brought moral power and spiritual energy into his life. Paul's mysticism never is content to rest in mystic contemplation or rapture; it never ahrens at the enjoyment of spiritual consolations. Mind meaning is brought to his mystical experience by recognition of what it enabled him to do. Working from within as the controlling impulse of his being, Christ took charge of Paul, ordered his activities, inspired his labors, strengthened his will, illuminated his mind, directed his journeys, softened his heart toward the unruly, gave him boldness, taught him contentment, delivered power to him. All these <u>characteristics</u> belong to the Paul in Christ, the Christ in Paul. Without inner dependence upon Christ we can not conceive how these astonishing testimonies, or the experiences they represent, could have been possible. Like a revolving structure in a dynamo, the personality of Christ worked in the mystic field of Paul's moral and spiritual consciousness, generating a power which was Paul's own, yet not his own; a power which Paul loved to call

The power of Christ unto salvation.[1]

---

1 Rom. 1:16.

From one point of view these four types of expression possess one peculiarity. They describe vertical, not horizontal, relationships; that is, they depict the relation of the individual to Christ, but not the relation of individuals to each other in Christ. We turn now to the expressions of Paul's mysticism which reveal its social aspect.

Expressions of Paul's Mysticism from the social point of view

We have seen from our study of those expressions of Paul's religious experience which related Christ to the individual that Paul regarded other believers capable of the same relationship which he enjoyed. As he was ἐν Χριστῷ, so might every man be ἐν Χριστῷ. Indeed, he regarded many members of his churches as already possessing that relationship. It was logical, therefore, that Paul should go one step further and declare mystical fellowship with Christ to be a <u>shared</u> relationship. This step carries Paul's religious experience of Christ from the individual into the social realm. Not only do Paul and other believers enjoy a mystical experience of Christ; they enjoy a mystical experience of one another in Christ. Paul's Christ-mysticism thus takes on a triangular character. Paul is united with believers just as he is united with Christ; believers are likewise in mystic relationship with Paul and with each other, just as they are with Christ.

From one point of view these four types of expression possess one peculiarity. They describe vertical, not horizontal, relationships; that is, they depict the relation of the individual to Christ, but not the relation of individuals to each other in Christ. We turn now to the expressions of Paul's mysticism which reveal its social aspect.

Expressions of Paul's Mysticism From the social point of view

We have seen from our study of those expressions of Paul's religious experience which related Christ to the individual that Paul regarded other believers capable of the same relationship which he enjoyed. As he was ex Xristw, no might every man be ex Xristw. Indeed, he regarded many members of his churches as actually possessing that relationship. It was logical, therefore, that Paul should go one step further and describe mystical fellowship with Christ to be a shared relationship. This step carries Paul's religious experience of Christ from the individual into the social realm. Not only do Paul and other believers enjoy a mystical experience of Christ; they enjoy a mystical experience of one another in Christ. Paul's Christ-mysticism thus takes on a triangular character. Paul is united with believers just as he is united with Christ; believers are likewise in mystic relationship with Paul and with each other, just as they are with Christ.

κοινωνία But Paul had at his command language far more expressive of this social aspect of religious experience than that by which we have described it. Two specific terms he used again and again. The first is κοινωνία.[1]

Paul tells the Corinthians they were called into the fellowship of God's son, Jesus Christ;[2] he assumes the relationship to be one of faith,[3] suffering,[4] and ministry;[5] the spirit of the fellowship is manifested in the matter of giving and receiving,[6] in sharing in the necessities of others,[7] and in the furtherance of the gospel.[8] Through the sharing of their common meals the Corinthians have fellowship with the body and blood of Christ.[9] The handclasp of the "pillars of the church" Paul receives as a symbol of fellowship.[10]

The solidarity of believers in the fellowship of Christ is often reflected by terms other than κοινωνία, but suggestive of the same intimacy of socio-mystical relationship. Paul thinks of his relation to other Christians in

---

1 Gal. 2:9; I Cor. 1:9, 10:16; II Cor. 6:14, 8:4, 13:13; Phil. 1:5, 2:1, 3:10; Eph. 3:9; Rom. 15:26; Phile. 6.

2 I Cor. 1:9. 3 Phile. 6. 4 Phil. 3:10.

5 Rom. 12:13, II Cor. 8:4. 6 Phil. 4:15. 7 Rom. 12:13, II Cor. 8:4.

8 Phil. 1:5. 9 I Cor. 10:16. 10 Gal. 2:9.

Agreement

But Paul had at his command language for more expressive of this social aspect of religious experience than that by which we have described it. Two specific terms he used again and again. The first is koinwnia.[1]

Paul tells the Corinthians they were called into the fellowship of God's son, Jesus Christ;[2] he assumes the relationship to be one of faith,[3] suffering,[4] and ministry;[5] the spirit of the fellowship is manifested in the matter of giving and receiving,[6] in sharing in the necessities of others,[7] and in the furtherance of the gospel.[8] Through the sharing of their common meals the Corinthians have fellowship with the body and blood of Christ.[9] The handicap of the "pillars of the church" Paul receives as a symbol of fellowship.[10]

The solidarity of believers in the fellowship of Christ is often reflected by terms other than koinwnia, but suggestive of the same intimacy of socio-spiritual relationship. Paul thinks of his relation to other Christians in

---

1 Gal. 2:9; I Cor. 1:9, 10:16; II Cor. 6:14, 8:4, 13:13; Phil. 1:5, 2:1, 3:10; Eph. 3:9; Rom. 15:26; Philem. 6.

2 I Cor. 1:9. 3 Philem. 6. 4 Phil. 3:10.

5 Rom. 12:13, II Cor. 8:4. 6 Phil. 4:15. 7 Rom. 15:26, II Cor. 8:4.

8 Phil. 1:5. 9 I Cor. 10:16. 10 Gal. 2:9.

terms of membership in a great family. He refers to Phoebe[1] and Apphia[2] as sisters; to the mother of Rufus as his mother;[3] to his brethren in the churches, and especially to Tychicus,[4] and Onesimus,[5] as brothers beloved; to his children in the faith and in the gospel;[6] and to his kinsmen.[7]

His fellowship with others in Christ is a working relationship:

> We are God's fellow-workers; ye are God's husbandry. [8]

Paul enumerates his own fellow-workers,[9] fellow-soldiers,[10] fellow-prisoners,[11] fellow-servants,[12] and fellow-slaves.[13] By virtue of their common experience of Christ they are bound in ties of closest intimacy one to another.

Returning now to the specific term κοινωνία, we ask whether it is possible to interpret it in such a way as to give meaning to Paul's mysticism. Does κοινωνία carry the

---

1 Rom. 16:1. 2 Phil. 1:12. 3 Rom. 16:11.

4 Eph. 6:21, Col. 4:7. 5 Phile. 2,6; Col. 4:9.

6 I Tim. 1:2, II Tim. 1:2, Titus 1:4, Phile. 10, Gal. 4:19, I Cor. 4:14.

7 Rom. 16:11, 21. 8 I Cor. 3:9.

9 Rom. 16:3, 9, 21; II Cor. 8:23, Phil. 2:25, Col. 4:11, Phile. 24.

10 Phil. 2:25, Phile. 23. 11 Col. 4:10, Rom. 16:7.

12 Col. 4:8. 13 Col. 1:7; 4:7.

terms of endearingly in a great family. He refers to Timothy and Titus[2] as sisters: to the mother of Rufus as his mother,[3] to his brethren in the churches, and especially to Tychicus,[4] and Onesimus,[5] as brothers beloved; to his children in the faith and in the gospel;[6] and to his kinsmen.[7]

His fellowship with others in Christ is a working relationship:

> We are God's fellow-workers; ye are God's husbandry.[8]

Paul enumerates his own fellow-workers,[9] fellow-soldiers,[10] fellow-prisoners,[11] fellow-servants,[12] and fellow-slaves.[13] By virtue of their common experience of Christ they are bound in bles of closest intimacy one to another.

Returning now to the specific term koinonia, we ask whether it is possible to interpret it in such a way as to give meaning to Paul's exhortation. Does koinonia carry the

---

1 Rom. 16:1. 2 Phil. 1:16. 3 Rom. 16:11.

4 Eph. 6:21, Col. 4:7. 5 Philem. 2, 6, Col. 4:9.

6 1 Tim. 1:2, 18 Tim. 1:2, Titus 1:4, Philem. 10, Col. 4:10, 1 Cor. 4:14.

7 Rom. 16:11, 21. 8 1 Cor. 3:9.

9 Rom. 16:3, 9, 21; 11 Cor. 8:23, Phil. 2:25, Col. 4:11, Philem. 24.

10 Phil. 2:25, Philem. 2. 11 Col. 4:10, Rom. 16:7.

12 Col. 4:8. 13 Col. 1:7; 4:7.

meaning of mystical fellowship, an association of persons in which the unitive principle is spiritual intimacy?

Campbell's study of κοινωνία

Professor J. Y. Campbell of Yale University has recently published a linguistic study of κοινωνία and its cognates,[1] the results of which deny this position. On the basis of a study of 600 occurences of the three words, κοινωνός, κοινωνεῖν, κοινωνία, in the works of more than 20 non-Biblical writers, Campbell presents the following conclusions. The primary meaning of κοινωνός is "participation in something;" this is proved by the marked infrequency of the dative of the person as compared with the frequency of the genitive of the thing. The verb κοινωνεῖν means primarily "to have something in common with someone else;" the idea of association with that other person is derivative and secondary. So with the noun κοινωνία : its meaning is "(the) having something in common with someone." Though the ideas of participation and association are both present, the former is primary. Thus these three terms refer not so much to an association of persons as to participation in things.

When, therefore, Campbell turns to the New Testament, he interprets these terms in conformity with the meaning he

---

1 "ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ and its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LI, Part IV, December, 1932, pp. 352-380.

meaning of mystical fellowship, an association of persons in which the unitive principle is spiritual intimacy.

Campbell's study of *koinonia* Professor J. T. Campbell of Yale University has recently published a linguistic study of *koinonia* and its compounds.[1] The results of which deny this position. On the basis of a study of 800 occurrences of the three words, *koinonos*, *koinonia*, *koinonein* in the works of more than 80 non-Biblical writers, Campbell concludes the following conclusions. The primary meaning of *koinonia* is "participation in something;" this is proved by the marked frequency of the dative of the person as compared with the frequency of the genitive of the thing. The word *koinonein* means primarily "to have something in common with someone else;" the idea of association with that other person is derivative and secondary. So with the noun *koinonos* : its meaning is "(the) having something in common with someone." Thus, the ideas of participation and association are both present, the former is primary. Thus these three terms refer not so much to an association of persons as to participation in things.

Then, therefore, Campbell turns to the New Testament, he interprets these terms in conformity with the meaning he

---

1 "*KOINONIA* and its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LI, Part IV, December, 1932, pp. 352-380.

found for them among non-Biblical writers. They refer not to a fellowship of believers, but to participation in something. Thus in Paul's use of the term κοινωνός in II Cor. 8:23, he means that Titus is his partner not as a member of a fellowship, but because he works with him for the Corinthians. Likewise, in his use of the verb κοινωνεῖν, Paul is referring not to personal relationships per se, but rather to making common cause of, or participating in, certain things. Phil. 4:14, since it employs the dative of the thing with which common cause is made, is not to be interpreted, "ye had fellowship with my affliction," but "ye made common cause with my affliction." So with Rom. 12:13; the meaning here is "making common cause with the needs of the saints." Rom. 15:27 is another instance of the dative of the thing shared. In Phil. 4:15 the meaning is, "No church shared with me a debit and credit account." So also Gal. 6:6: "Let him that is instructed have all good things in common with his instructor."

The noun κοινωνία causes Campbell a little more difficulty. Phile. v.6 means "the sharing of your faith," or, "I pray that by their participation in your loyal faith . ." Phil. 3:10 ought to be translated not by the term "fellowship" but as " the sharing of his sufferings," i.e., "a real participation in the sufferings of Christ, not merely sympathy with him in his sufferings . ." For Phil. 1:5 Campbell has no translation

found for them among non-Biblical writers. They refer not to a fellowship, or partnership, but to participation in something. Thus in Paul's use of the term κοινωνεω in II Cor. 8:23, he means that Titus is his partner not as a member of a fellowship, but insofar as works with him for the Corinthians. Likewise, in his use of the verb κοινωνεω, Paul is referring not to personal relationship per se, but rather to sharing common cause of, or participating in, certain things. Phil. 4:14, since it employs the dative of the thing with which common cause is made, is not to be interpreted, "ye had fellowship with my affliction," but "ye made common cause with my affliction." So with Rom. 12:13; the meaning here is "making common cause with the needs of the saints." Rom. 15:27 is another instance of the dative of the thing shared. In Phil. 4:15 the meaning is, "no church shared with me a debit and credit account." So also Gal. 6:6: "Let him that is instructed have all good things in common with his instructor."

"No more κοινωνεω" causes Campbell a little more difficulty. While v.6 means "the sharing of your faith," or, "I pray that by their participation in your loyal faith . . ." Phil. 3:10 ought to be translated not by the term "fellowship" but as " the sharing of his sufferings," i.e., "I feel participation in the sufferings of Christ, not merely sympathy with him in his sufferings . . ." For Phil. 1:5 Campbell has no translation

of his own; he calls it the only instance of a subjective genitive with κοινωνία in the New Testament. Gal. 2:9 uses the term in the absolute sense: the right hand of fellowship is given "on the understanding that we were to go to the Gentiles and they to the Jews." This indicates that κοινωνία here still has quite definitely the sense of "partnership," "going shares in an enterprise," rather than the vaguer sense of "fellowship." I Cor. 10:14 ff. can mean naturally only "participation (with others) in the blood of Christ" and "in the body of Christ," because 1) it is a use of the genitive of the thing shared, and 2) because αἷμα and σῶμα denote <u>things</u> in which one can participate. Phil. 2:1, II Cor. 13:14, and I Cor. 1:9 are all to be interpreted in this same sense of participation in the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and Christ. Thus the primary and common meaning of κοινωνία is "participation along with others in something."

Granted that Paul always uses these terms in precisely the same way in which classical writers employ them, (which is a debatable question), Campbell's results do not appear to rule out finally the possibility of interpreting κοινωνία to mean <u>fellowship</u>. We noted that Campbell readily admits the presence of the idea of <u>association</u> in the term κοινωνία , though in a derived sense. What Campbell cannot determine with precision is whether this idea of association was relegated to a place of secondary importance in Paul's thought and experience. To

of his own. He calls it the only language of a subjective reality with reference in the new Testament. Gal. 5:5 uses the term in the absolute sense; the right hand of fellowship is given "on the understanding that we were to go to the gentiles and they to the Jews." This indicates textwarning here still has quite definitely the sense of "partnership," "going shares in an enterprise," rather than the vaguer sense of "fellowship." I Cor. 10:16 ff. can mean naturally only "participation (with others) in the blood of Christ" and "in the body of Christ," because 1) it is a use of the sacrifice of the living Jesus, and 2) because we are very remote today in which one can participate. Mat. 5:1, II Cor. 13:14, and I Cor. 1:9 are all to be interpreted in this same sense of participation in the Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and Christ. Thus the primary and common meaning of koinonia is "participation along with others in something."

Grounded that Paul always uses these terms in precisely the same way in which classical writers widely then. (which is a debatable question). Campbell's results do not appear to rule out finally the possibility of inter relations existing to mean fellowship. We noted that Campbell readily admits the presence of the idea of association in the term koinonia, though in a derived sense. What Campbell cannot determine with precision is whether this idea of association was relegated to a idea of secondary importance in Paul's thought and experience. To

admit that the elements of participation in a thing and association of persons may well have existed together in a given experience is to leave the door open for an interpretation of it in terms of mystical fellowship. When we approach Paul's use of the term κοινωνία from the psychological point of view, it is difficult indeed to determine which element was uppermost in his experience. In any case, sharers in the sufferings of Christ, in the work of the furtherance of the gospel, in the spirit, in the body and blood of Christ, and Christ himself, could not avoid strong feelings of kinship for each other, nor fail to experience those psychic ties which bind those who participate in common experiences.

It is at this very point that the mystical element enters; those who participate jointly in common tasks feel drawn to each other by ties quite as real as those which bind them individually to their tasks. It is this inner rapport which is the mystical element. Though intangible, difficult of explanation psychologically, it is none the less real. Here are Paul and Titus, co-laborers in Christ on behalf of the Corinthians, co-ministers to the Corinthians' spiritual life. As Paul and Titus talked over common problems, rehearsed certain vivid personal experiences of Christ, debated what course to pursue in relation to the Corinthians, prayed together, compared experiences together, it was inevitable

could that the elements of participation in a union and association of persons may well have existed together in a given experience in to love. The door open for an interpretation of it in terms of mystical fellowship. Then we approach Paul's use of the term koinonia. From the psychological point of view, it is difficult indeed to determine which element was uppermost in his experience. In my case, whether in the suffering of Christ, in the work of the furtherance of the gospel, in the spirit, in the body and blood of Christ, and Christ himself, could not avoid strong feelings of kinship for each other, nor fail to experience those psychic ties which bind those who participate in common experiences.

It is at this very point that the mystical element enters; those who participate jointly in common tasks feel drawn to each other by ties quite as real as those which bind them individually to their Lord. It is this inner *koinonia* which is the mystical element. Though intangible, difficult of explanation psychologically, it is none the less real. Here are Paul and Silas, co-labores in Christ on behalf of the Corinthians, co-ministers to the Corinthians' spiritual life. As Paul and Silas turned over common problems, reserved certain vivid personal experiences of Christ, debated what course to pursue in relation to the Corinthians, prayed together, compared experiences together, it was inevitable

that they should become conscious of an inner bond which each intuitively perceived as partaking of the personality of the other. It is to such relationships that Paul alludes by his use of the term κοινωνία, and his phrases "fellow-workers," "fellow-sufferers," "fellow-slaves," "fellow-prisoners," and "fellow-soldiers." Such relationships Paul conceives to partake not only of the personalities of his human friends, but also of the personality of Christ.

Fellowship as Paul experienced it was not limited to select workers particularly well known to him. It was open to all who were in Christ. Every member of the Christian community whose relationship to Christ was vital held membership in it. The Philippians who shared Paul's affliction in sympathy, understanding, and kindliness; the Corinthians sitting at common meal, and experiencing imaginatively the fellowship of the body and blood of Christ; the leaders of the eastern churches, James, Peter, and John; the small groups of the devout in Galatia and Asia Minor, where Paul had preached and taught so long; all these comprised the mystic fellowship of those who, by their personal relationship to Christ, were intimately related one to another. To the reality of this mystical relationship with Christ and with one another Paul paid one of his highest tributes when he placed it alongside the love of God and the grace of Christ in the apostolic benediction.[1]

---

1 II Cor. 13:14.

that they should become conscious of an inner bond which each instinctively perceives as partaking of the personality of the other. It is to such relationship that Paul alludes by his use of the term koinonia, and his phrases "fellow-workers," "fellow-sufferers," "fellow-slaves," "fellow-soldiers," and "fellow-soldiers." Such relationships Paul conceives to partake not only of the personalities of his human friends, but also of the personality of Christ.

Followship as Paul experienced it was not limited to select persons particularly well known to him. It was open to all who were in Christ. Every member of the Christian community whose relationship to Christ was vital held membership in it. The Philippians who shared Paul's affliction in sympathy, understanding, and kindness; the Corinthians sitting at common meal, and by participation imaginatively the followship of the body and blood of Christ; the lessons of the eastern churches, Jerusalem, Antioch, and Rome; the small groups of the church in Galatia and Asia Minor, where Paul had preached and taught so long; all these comprised the mystic followship of those who, by their personal relationship to Christ, were intimately related one to another. To the reality of this mystical relationship with Christ and with one another Paul gives one of his richest tributes when he pleaded it throughout the love of God and the grace of Christ in the apostolic benediction.[1]

---

1 II Cor. 13:14.

The "temple of Christ" and "the body of Christ"

Paul uses another group of expressions to describe religious experience in its social aspect: the "temple of Christ," the "building of Christ," and the "body of Christ;" all of which refer to what he elsewhere characterizes "fellowship." The first two expressions are found in his letters infrequently. He inquires of the Corinthians,

> Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? [1]

Elsewhere he refers to them as "God's building." [2]

And to the Ephesians he writes,

> . . . ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit. [3]

He indicates that the bodies of believers are

> a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God . . and ye are not your own. [4]

By far the most telling metaphor applied by Paul to the fellowship of believers with Christ is his term the "body

---

1 I Cor. 3:16-17.

2 I Cor. 3:9.

3 Eph. 2:19-22.

4 I Cor. 6:19.

The "temple of Christ" and "the body of Christ" Paul uses another group of expressions to describe relations concerning in the social account: the "temple of Christ," the "building of Christ," and the "body of Christ;" all of which refer to what he elsewhere characterizes "fellowship." The first two expressions are found in his letters interpretively. He inquires of the Corinthians,

> Know ye not that ye are a temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? 1

Elsewhere he refers to them as "God's building."[2]

And to the Ephesians he writes,

> . . . ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Himself being the chief corner-stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into a holy temple in the Lord: in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit. 3

He indicates that the bodies of believers are

> a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God . . . and ye are not your own. 4

By far the most telling metaphor applied by Paul to the fellowship of believers with Christ is his term the "body

---

1 1 Cor. 3:16-17. 2 1 Cor. 3:9.

3 Eph. 2:19-22. 4 1 Cor. 6:19.

of Christ," - σῶμα Χριστοῦ. To the Corinthians he writes

> Now are ye the body of Christ, and severally members thereof. [1]

To the Ephesians,

> There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling. [2]

> . . . we are members of his body . . This mystery is great: but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church. [3]

The Gentiles who are in Christ

> are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body. [4]

To the Romans he declares that just as the individual possesses many members in one body,

> so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another. [5]

There are, in the main, two broad lines of interpretation which may be applied to this conception of the "body of Christ." Both claim to find in the conception the element of mysticism. The first is that pursued by Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer holds that Paul's phrase

> We are all baptized into one body, [6]

is to be understood literally;[7] on the basis of Paul's statement

---

1 I Cor. 12:27. 2 Eph. 4:4. 3 Eph. 5:30-32.

4 Eph. 3:6. 5 Rom. 12:5. 6 I Cor. 12:13.

7 Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 118.

of Christ." - Paul's words. To the Corinthians he writes

> Now are ye the body of Christ, and severally members thereof. 1

To the Ephesians,

> There is one body and one Spirit, even as also ye were called in one hope of your calling. 2

> . . . We are members of his body . . . This mystery is great; but I speak in regard of Christ and of the Church. 3

The Colossians who are in Christ

> are fellow-heirs, and fellow-members of the body. 4

To the Romans he believes that just as the individual possesses many members in one body,

> so we, who are many, are one body in Christ, and severally members one of another. 5

There are, in the main, two broad lines of interpretation which may be applied to this conception of the "body of Christ." Both claim to find in the conception the element of mysticism. The first is that proposed by Albert Schweitzer. Schweitzer notes that Paul's phrase

> We are all baptized into one body. 6

is to be understood literally, on the basis of Paul's statement

---

1 I Cor. 12:27. 2 Eph. 4:4. 3 Eph. 5:30-32.

4 Eph. 3:6. 5 Rom. 12:5. 6 I Cor. 12:13.

7 Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 112.

that the Galatians are "one in Christ,"[1] he declares that they, with one another and with Christ, form a "joint personality."[2] After discussing the importance of baptism, by which alone the believer can be "grafted into" the mystical body of Christ, and arguing that being in Christ can only mean being a partaker of the mystical body of Christ,[3] Schweitzer summarizes his interpretation as follows:

> The Mystical Body of Christ is thus for Paul not a pictorial expression, nor a conception which has arisen out of symbolical and ethical reflections, but an actual entity. Only so can it be explained that not only can Christ suffer for the Elect, but also the Elect for Christ and for one another. This reciprocity of relations is founded on the fact that the existences in question are physically interdependent in the same corporeity, and the one can pass over into the other.[4]

And again, considering I Cor. 7:12-14, he says,

> (This passage) shows that Paul is prepared to accept in the fullest measure the implications of his doctrine of the union of the believers with Christ as a physical bodily union.[5]

---

1 Gal. 3:28. 2 Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 118.

3 Ibid, p. 123; so also C.A.A.Scott: the society of the redeemed "was regarded by him (Paul) as a corporate personality." Op. cit., p. 156

4 Schweitzer, op. cit., p. 127; (underscoring mine).

5 Ibid, p. 128; (underscoring mine).

Schweitzer's conclusion, therefore, is that Paul had a "mystical doctrine of physical union with Christ." [1] Such a view is utterly unintelligible. A doctrine of physical union would be intelligible, though to our notion, wholly unwarranted by the evidence. But to mix the physical and the mystical is to betray the fundamental principles of mysticism. Mysticism is essentially spiritual, non-material, non-physical. And Paul's mysticism, as F. C. Porter observes in commenting upon Schweitzer's view,

> is best characterized as personal rather than as physical, as love rather than as corporeity, [2]

We reject as unsatisfactory, therefore, this first line of interpretation which construes the "body of Christ" as a physical, corporate entity.

A second broad line of interpretation looks upon the "body of Christ" as a term descriptive of the personal, mystic relationship which Paul conceived as binding believers to Christ and to each other. This line of interpretation renders more intelligible the facts at hand. Paul's "body of Christ" is not to be regarded as a dogmatic concept, but as a reflection of personal experience. In his contact with believers in his various churches Paul was conscious of an

---

1 Op. cit., p. 127. 2 Porter, op. cit., p. 311, note.

Schweitzer's conclusion, therefore, is that Paul had a "spiritual doctrine of physical union with Christ."[1] Such a view is utterly antithetical. A doctrine of physical union could be intelligible, though to our notion, wholly unwarranted by the evidence. But to mix the physical and the mystical is to destroy the fundamental principles of mysticism. Mysticism is essentially spiritual, non-material, non-physical. And Paul's mysticism, as R. C. Porter observes in commenting upon Schweitzer's view,

> is best characterized as personal rather than as physical, as love rather than as corporeity.[2]

To reject as unsatisfactory, therefore, this first line of interpretation which construes the "body of Christ" as a physical, corporate entity.

A second broad line of interpretation looks upon the "body of Christ" as a term descriptive of the personal, mystic relationship which Paul conceived as binding believers to Christ and to each other. This line of interpretation ignores more intelligibly the facts at hand. Paul's "body of Christ" is not to be regarded as a mechanic concept, but as a reflection of personal experience. In his contact with believers in his various churches Paul was conscious of an

---

1 Op. cit., p. 127. 2 Porter, op. cit., p. 211, note.

influence exerted by the personality of Jesus Christ upon them, an influence which generated attitudes of love and affection each to the other. The personal attachments of men to Christ and of Christ to men, and of men in Christ to each other, Paul calls the "body of Christ." The spirit of Christ, finding incarnation in relationships of intimacy among those who clave to him, is thus embodied in those relationships.

Paul uses this term not literally, but imaginatively. It is the representation of a non-material, non-physical, intangible experience of fellowship. Paul needed such a term as "the body of Christ." He needed it to hold together in unity a group of men and women widely diverse in age, character, race, economic status, and cultural attainment. He sought to bind this group together with the one common tie that his ministry had brought to all of them: their experience of Christ.

In uniformly hostile environments, where to be known as Christians was cause for epithet and opprobrium, political and economic persecution, or social ostracism, the small groups of Christians that comprised Paul's churches would come to cherish the secret bond that held them in spiritual rapport. The esoteric element in the early Christian

influence exerted by the personality of Jesus Christ upon them, an influence which generated attitudes of love and affection each to the other. The personal attachments of men to Christ and of Christ to men, and of men in Christ to each other, Paul calls the "body of Christ." The spirit of Christ, finding incarnation in relationships of intimacy among those who cleave to him, is then embodied in those relationships.

Paul uses this term not literally, but imaginatively. It is the representation of a non-material, non-physical, intangible experience of fellowship. Paul needed such a term as "the body of Christ." He needed it to hold together in unity a group of men and women widely diverse in age, character, race, economic status, and cultural attainment. He sought to bind this group together with the one common tie that his ministry had brought to all of them: their experience of Christ.

In another hostile environment, where to be known as Christians was cause for opinion, and opposition, political and economic persecution, or social ostracism, the small groups of Christians that determined Paul's character would come to cherish the secret bond that held them in mystical rapport. The esoteric element in the early Christian

fellowship must certainly have emotionalized and vivified the personal attachments which its members felt for each other and for Christ. They might well think of themselves as the mystical "body of Christ."

Again we suggest that this mystical experience takes on meaning as it is interpreted personally and functionally. We have seen something of the general purpose it served; now we turn to the letters for information concerning its more specific meaning.

Here the genius of Paul for finding apt metaphors to describe his religious experience and to illustrate his teaching is clearly revealed. In the "body of Christ" Paul hit upon an expression which allows for the allegorizing so characteristic of him. What better figure could Paul have employed to describe the unity in which believers could yet exercise their own individual functions? In the "body of Christ" men and women of varied gifts and talents could develop their capacities, yet be bound in an intimate relationship with Christ and with each other. So Paul plays upon the idea of unity of spirit and diversity of function. He exhorts the Romans, as members of one body, yet possessing different offices,

> . . . and having gifts differing
> according to the grace that was
> given us, whether prophecy, let

Fellowship must certainly have sensitized and vivified the personal attachments which the members felt for each other and for Christ. They might well think of themselves as the mystical "body of Christ."

Again we suggest that this mystical experience takes on meaning as it is interpreted personally and functionally. We have seen something of the general purpose it served; now we turn to the letters for information concerning its more specific meaning.

Here the genius of Paul for finding out metaphors to describe his religious experiences and to illuminate his teaching is clearly revealed. In the "body of Christ" Paul hit upon an expression which allows for the affirmations so characteristic of him. That metaphor alone could Paul have employed to describe the unity in which believers could yet exercise their own individual functions. In the "body of Christ" men and women of varied gifts and talents could develop their capacities, yet be bound in an intimate relationship with Christ and with each other. So Paul plays upon the idea of unity of parts and diversity of function. He directs the Roman, as members of one body, yet possessing different offices.

> . . . and having gifts differing
> according to the grace that was
> given us, whether prophecy, let

> us prophesy, . . or ministry let us give ourselves to our ministry; or he that teacheth, to his teaching; or he that exhorteth, to his exhorting: he that giveth, let him do it with liberality; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that showeth mercy, with cheerfulness. [1]

To the Ephesians Paul makes a similar plea:

> But unto each of us was the grace given according to the measure of the gift of Christ . . And he gave some to be apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, unto the work of ministering, unto the building up of the body of Christ: till we all attain unto the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: that we . . may grow up in all things unto him, who is the head, even Christ: from whom all the body fitly framed and knit together through that which every joint supplieth, according to the working in due measure of each several part, maketh the increase of the body unto the building up of itself in love. [2]

The classic passage in which Paul deals with the diversity of functions in the members of the body of Christ is found in I Corinthians.[3] After declaring God to be the worker and author of these manifestations of the Spirit, Paul enumerates the various functions: the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge,

---

1 Rom. 12:4-8. 2 Eph. 4:7-16. 3 I Cor. 12:4-11.

> as prophecy, . . or ministry let
> us give ourselves to our minis-
> try; or he that teacheth, to his
> teaching; or he that exhorteth,
> to his exhorting; he that giveth,
> let him do it with liberality; he
> that ruleth, with diligence; he
> that showeth mercy, with cheer-
> fulness. 1

To the Ephesians Paul means a similar plan:

> Unto each of us was the grace
> given according to the measure of
> the gift of Christ . . And he gave
> some to be apostles; and some,
> prophets; and some, evangelists;
> and some, pastors and teachers; for
> the perfecting of the saints, unto
> the work of ministering, unto the
> building up of the body of Christ;
> till we all attain unto the unity
> of the faith, and of the knowledge
> of the Son of God, unto a full-grown
> man, unto the measure of the stature
> of the fulness of Christ: that we
> may grow up in all things unto him,
> who is the head, even Christ: from
> whom all the body fitly framed and
> knit together through that which
> every joint supplieth, according to
> the working in due measure of each
> several part, maketh the increase
> of the body unto the building up of
> itself in love. 2

The classic passage in which Paul deals with the diversity of functions in the members of the body of Christ is found in I Corinthians.[3] After declaring God to be the worker and author of these manifestations of the Spirit, Paul enumerates the various functions: the word of wisdom, the word of knowledge,

---

1 Rom. 12:6-8. 2 Eph. 4:7-16. 3 I Cor. 12:4-11.

faith, gifts of healing, workings of miracles (powers), prophecy, discernings of spirits, speaking in divers kinds of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. By analogy to the interdependence of the members of the physical body, Paul argues the interdependence of spiritual functions. In the body of Christ all members are necessary: the feeble as well as the strong; comeliness is added to uncomely parts; honors are shared; there is no schism in the body; the members care for each other, suffer for each other, honor each other, rejoice in each other.

> But all these worketh the one and the same Spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. [1]

Membership in the "body of Christ" has many other functional implications. It involves recognition of the membership of others,[2] the cultivation of a common mind,[3] the spirit of unity in speech,[4] and praise.[5] But in all its variety of function, the "body of Christ" retains its unity in Christ and its dependence upon Christ, who is its head. "Is Christ divided?" Paul asks.[6] No, there is

---

1 I Cor. 12:11-12. 2 II Cor. 10:7, Rom. 14:7.

3 I Cor. 2:16, II Cor. 13:11, Phil. 2:2,5, Rom. 12:16; 15:5.

4 I Cor. 1:10. 5 Rom. 15:6. 6 I Cor. 6:17.

faith, gifts of healing, workings of miracles (powers), prophecy, discernings of spirits, speaking in diverse kinds of tongues, and the interpretation of tongues. By analogy to the interdependence of the members of the physical body, Paul stress the interdependence of spiritual functions. In the body of Christ all members are necessary; the feeble as well as the strong; comliness is shown to seemingly certain members are absent; there is no schism in the body; the members care for each other, suffer for each other, honor each other, rejoice in each other.

> But all these worketh the one and the same spirit, dividing to each one severally even as he will. For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of the body, being many, are one body; so also is Christ. [1]

Membership in the "body of Christ" has many other functional implications. It involves recognition of the membership of others,[2] the cultivation of a common mind,[3] the spirit of unity in speech,[4] and praise,[5] and in all its variety of functions, the "body of Christ" retains its unity in Christ and its dependence upon Christ, who is its head. "In Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."[6] So, there is

---

1 I Cor. 12:11-12. 2 II Cor. 10:7, Rom. 14:7.

3 I Cor. 2:16, II Cor. 13:11, Phil. 2:2,5, Rom. 12:16, 15:5.

4 I Cor. 1:10. 5 Rom. 15:6. 6 I Cor. 5:17.

> one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father over all, through all, and in all. [1]

Therefore are the Christians to

> stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith in the gospel. [2]

For

> he that is joined unto the Lord is one spirit. [3]

Through this review of the variety of functions of the "body of Christ" we come to a new appreciation of what Paul meant by the term. In a metaphorical sense we may say that believers were "incorporated" in the "body of Christ." Just as today a group of men who agree to conduct a business enterprise together enter into a personal relationship with each other which is defined and articulated by legal articles of incorporation, by which responsibility is jointly assumed, privileges shared, management vested in specific persons, offices established, work delegated, functions of members recognized, and thereby constitute a body which, though having no physical corporeality, exists in the form of real, definite, and binding personal relationships and attachments, so, by analogy, Paul and believers are "incorporated" in the "body

---

1 Eph. 4:4, I Cor. 8:6; 6:17. 2 Phil. 1:27.

3 I Cor. 6:17.

one body, one Spirit, one hope,
one Lord, one faith, one bap-
tism, one God and Father over
all, through all, and in all. 1

Therefore are the Christians to

stand fast in one spirit, with
one soul striving for the faith
in the gospel. 2

For

he that is joined unto the Lord
is one spirit. 3

Through this review of the variety of functions of the "body of Christ" we come to a new appreciation of what Paul meant by the term. In a metaphorical sense we may say that believers were "incorporated" in the "body of Christ." Just as today a group of men who agree to conduct a business enterprise together enter into a personal relationship with each other which is defined and articulated by legal articles of incorporation, by which responsibility is jointly assumed, privileges shared, management vested in specific persons, offices established, work delegated, functions of members coordinated, and thereby constitute a body which, though having no physical corporeality, exists in the form of rent, earnings, and binding personal relationships and attachments, so, by analogy, Paul and believers are "incorporated" in the "body

---

1 Eph. 4:4, 1 Cor. 12:9; 6:17. 2 Phil. 1:27.

3 1 Cor. 6:17.

of Christ"; a spiritual, personal fellowship bearing the name of its head, the articles of incorporation for which provide that each member shall be joined in vital relationship to the head, commit himself to the welfare of the whole, and exercise that function best suited to his endowments, while maintaining constantly the bond of fellowship both with the head of the body, Christ, and all its members.

Throughout this extended study of the post-conversion expressions of Paul's mysticism from both the individual and the social points of view we have interpreted the mystical element in Paul in three ways: 1) personally; Paul's experience with Christ and with others in Christ is always a relation between persons; 2) functionally; Paul's mysticism takes on meaning both individually and socially through recognition of what he and other believers are led to do under the impulse of their Christ-relationship; 3) dynamically; Paul's sharing of the experience of Christ inevitably issues in moral power and ethical conduct of life.

What kind of a mystic is Paul?

On what grounds can Paul be called a mystic? The canons of mysticism were not determined by him. The lives of countless saints through the long Christian ages have furnished the data from which the characteristics of mystical religion have been deduced. When,

of Christ"; a spiritual, personal fellowship bearing the name of its head, the articles of incorporation for which provide that each member shall be joined in vital relationship to the head, consecrated to the welfare of the whole, and exercise that faithful best united to his endowments, while maintaining consistently the bond of fellowship both with the head of the body, Christ, and all its members.

Throughout this extended study of the post-conversion experiences of Paul's mysticism from both the individual and the social points of view we have interpreted the mystical element in Paul in three ways: 1) Personality: Paul's experience with Christ and with others in Christ is always a relation between persons; 2) Functionality: Paul's mysticism takes on meaning both individually and socially through recognition of what he and other believers are led to do under the impulse of their Christ-relationship; 3) Dynamicality: Paul's showing of the experience of Christ inevitably issues in moral power and ethical conduct of life.

What kind of a mystic is Paul? On what grounds can Paul be called a mystic? The canons of mysticism were not determined by him. The lives of countless saints through the long Christian ages have furnished the data from which the characteristics of mystical religion have been deduced. When,

therefore, Paul is called a mystic, he is identified with a type of religious experience the character of which was established by the experience of men and women who lived in later periods of history, under environments and religious traditions radically different from his own. He and his religion bear enough resemblance to the mystics and mysticism of later ages to justify the application of the term mystic to him; for one central element he has in common with all religious mystics: an immediate awareness of the presence of the divine in his life. But Paul cannot be identified with earlier or later mystics, nor can his mysticism be defined in terms of any other. Its dissimilarity to the mysticism of the Hellenic Mysteries, to mediaeval Catholic piety, and to seventeenth century Quietism, for example, is equally marked. We should be led far afield were we to seek understanding of his mysticism through any other medium than that of his own personal religious experience. We ought, therefore, to establish the individual character of his mysticism. What kind of a mystic is Paul?

In the first place, Paul's mysticism is marked by a freedom from the self-conscious, deliberately cultivated use of <u>method</u> in the inner life so characteristic of most mysticism. Many of the great mystics of the church employed a carefully developed spiritual technique in their effort to achieve union

therefore, Paul is called a mystic, he is identified with a type of religious experience the character of which was established by the experience of men and women who lived in later periods of history, under environments and religious traditions radically different from his own. He and his religion owe much resemblance to the mystics and mysticism of later ages; to justify the application of this term mystic to him; for one central element he has in common with all religious mystics: an immediate awareness of the presence of the divine in his life. But Paul cannot be identified with earlier or later mystics, nor can his mysticism be defined in terms of any other. Its dissimilarity to the mysticism of the Eleusinian Mysteries, to mediaeval Catholic piety, and to seventeenth century quietism, for example, is equally marked. We should be led far afield were we to seek understanding of his mysticism through any other medium than that of his own personal religious experience. We ought, therefore, to establish the individual character of his mysticism. What kind of a mystic is Paul?

In the first place, Paul's mysticism is marked by a freedom from the self-conscious, deliberately cultivated use of methods in the inner life so characteristic of that mysticism. Many of the great mystics of the church employed a carefully devised scientific technique in their efforts to achieve union

with God. Their inner lives conformed to certain established patterns which called for a series of progressive spiritual exercises. We saw in the first section of this thesis that three well-defined stages marked the mystic way. First purgation: the effort of the mystic to disentangle himself from the web of sense and illusion through the cultivation of self-knowledge, humility, and penitence; an effort aimed at spiritual detachment. Second, illumination: the concentration of all the faculties upon God in the hope of discovering new conceptions of the divine, or new directions for conduct. At this stage the mental exercises of "orison," recollection, quiet, and contemplation are employed with scrupulous care. Third, unity: pure contemplation of the divine, interrupted by ecstatic experiences in which the subject feels himself freed from his own self, and united with God. At this stage the mystic feels his will to be one with God's will; his union with God finds expression in ennobled conduct in the world.

What in common with this consciously practiced inner technique has Paul? True, there are indications that he entered into experiences similar to those arrived at by mystics at various stages on the mystic way. For example, he feels freed from the flesh, and the passions of the flesh;[1] he declares

---

1 Rom. 7:5-6; 8:2.

with God. Their inner lives conformed to certain metaphysical patterns which called for a series of progressive spiritual experiences. We see in the first section of this thesis that these well-defined stages arrose the mystic way. First purgation: the effort of the mystic to disentangle himself from the web of sense and illusion through the cultivation of self-knowledge, humility, and penitence; an effort aimed at spiritual detachment. Second, illumination: the concentration of all the faculties upon God in the hope of discovering new conceptions of the divine, or new directions for conduct. It will show the mental exercises of "prison," recollection, quiet, and contemplation are employed with surprising care. Third, unity: pure contemplation of the divine, intensified by ecstatic experiences in which the subject feels himself freed from his own self, and united with God. It will show the mystic feels his will to be one with God's will; his union with God finds expression in exceptional conduct in the world.

What is common with this consciously practiced inner technique has truly. Then, there are indications that he entered into experiences similar to those arrived at by mystics of various stages on the mystic way. For example, he feels freed from the flesh, and the passions of the flesh;[1] he declares

---

1. Rom. 7:5-6; etc.

that he and the Corinthians

> henceforth know no man after the flesh; [1]

that old things are passed away.[2] These references might be interpreted as indications of some experience of "purgation" in his life. We can discover experiences of "illumination." His visions, recounted previously, gave him new conceptions of God, and new ideas for the conduct of his missionary enterprise. That he found, throughout his life, new interior avenues of approach to God through Christ Jesus we cannot deny. Certainly he speculated daringly concerning the illuminating experience of Damascus. It is quite possible that his three years in Arabia were filled with illuminating experiences. We find evidence of what might be called "contemplation" in his letters.[3] And there is at least one experience recorded in his letters which approximates "ecstasy".[4]

But these experiences of Paul, so readily comparable to those of the later mystics, dare not be identified or classified with the experiences of the later mystics. Paul did not arrive at "purgation","illumination", and "ecstasy" in the way that Teresa or Madame Guyon arrived at them. Indeed, in contrast to the later mystics of the church, Paul arrived at them

---

1 II Cor. 5:16. 2 II Cor. 5:17.

3 II Cor. 2:10; Col. 3:2; Phil. 4:8. 4 II Cor. 12:2-4.

that he saw the Corinthians:

"Therefore from no man after the flesh;"[1]

that old things are passed away.[2] These references might be interpreted as indications of some experience of "surrender" in his life. He has discover experiences of "illumination." His visions, recounted reluctantly, gave him new conceptions of God, and new ideas for the conduct of his missionary enterprise. Paul he found, throughout his life, new interior senses of surrender to God through Christ Jesus as Lord. Certainly he experienced deeply overwhelming the illuminating experience of Damascus. It is quite possible that his three years in Arabia were filled with illuminating experiences. The final evidence of such might be called "illumination" in his letters.[3] And there is at least one experience recorded in his letters which approximates "ecstasy".[4]

But these experiences of Paul, no readily comparable to those of the later mystics, have not so identified or significant with the experiences of the later mystics. Paul did not arrive at "surrender", "illumination", and "ecstasy" in the way that Teresa or Madame Guyon arrived at them. Indeed, in contrast to the later mystics of the church, Paul arrived at them

---

1 II Cor. 5:16. 2 II Cor. 5:17.

3 II Cor. 3:18; Col. 3:3; Phil. 4:6. 4 II Cor. 12:2-4.

without the employment of any technique whatever. If he experienced anything like "purgation," it was brought about by the shock of re-creation in Christ, - an experience which freed him not primarily of the desires of the flesh, but from the conflict and despair of his law-bound life. If he knew any "illumination" of the inner life, it came not through laborious effort in mental concentration performed in a methodical way apart from the busy world, but through submitting the real problems of daily life to the divine will for illumination and solution. If he practiced "contemplation" it was not

> an action of the man, who following a method for the training of the soul which he has learnt, climbs up the ladder to heaven rung by rung until he reaches union with the Deity. Pauline contemplation is a reaction to a divine visitation; . . . Contemplation consists (for Paul) both in the believer steeping himself, being submerged, in the revealed 'deep things of God,'[1] and in a struggle with practical problems.[2]

And as for "ecstasy," though he had mounted to the third heaven, Paul sees no reason to glory therein; he prefers rather to glory in persecutions, distresses, necessities.[3] Even among those who claim that Paul was an ecstatic, there is ready acknowledgement of the minor role which his ecstatic experience played

---

1 I Cor. 2:10. 2 Deissmann, Paul, pp. 105-106.

3 II Cor. 12:10.

without the employment of any technique whatever. If he experienced anything like "mysticism," it was brought about by the shock of re-orientation in Christ, - an experience which freed him not primarily of the desires of the flesh, but from the conflict and disparity of his low-bound life. If he once had "illumination" of the inner life, it came not through laborious effort in mental concentration conformed in a methodical way apart from the busy world, but through submitting the real problems of daily life to the divine will for illumination and solution. If he practiced "contemplation" it was not

> as action of the man, who following
> a method for the training of the
> soul which he has learnt, climbs up
> the ladder to heaven rung by rung
> until he reaches union with the
> Deity. Christian contemplation is a
> reaction to a divine visitation;
> . . Contemplation consists (for
> God) both in the whatever sleep-
> ing humanity, being submerged, in
> the revealed 'deep things of God,' I
> and in a struggle with practical problems. 2

And as for "ecstasy," though he had recourse to the third heaven, and made no reason to glory therein; he prefers rather to glory in infirmities, distresses, necessities.3 Even among those who claim that Paul was an ecstatic, there is rarely acknowledgement of the minor role which his ecstatic experiences played

---

1 I Cor. 2:10. 2 Delehaye, Paul, pp. 108-109.

3 II Cor. 12:10.

in his life.[1]

No, Paul's mysticism is marked in the first instance by his very freedom from a self-imposed inner technique. He knew nothing of "orison," nothing of "the graces of interior prayer," as employed by mediaeval Catholic mystics. He did not hide from the world to seek spiritual consolations. He never allowed himself to lapse into self-induced passivity. No "sleep of the powers" overcame his restless, roving spirit.

If we compare Paul with a great mystic like St. Teresa, (1515-1582), we are forced to declare that he experienced little of what she experienced in her four stages: Meditation, the Orison of Quiet, the Sleep of the Powers, and the Flight of the Soul. It is the state which Teresa calls "spiritual marriage", in which the purified soul, emerging from these earlier stages, and now partly or entirely free from the accidents of rapture, ecstasy, dryness, et cetera, performs among men the will of God, to which Paul's active life in Christ bears most marked resemblance.

Paul's mysticism took its rise in a great initial experience in which the power of God was revealed and imparted

---

1 Weber, Christus-Mystik, S. 45-6, says

> . . . diese vollekstatischen Zustände für das religiöse Leben des Apostels keine ausschlaggebende Rolle gespielt hat.

in his life.[1]

So, Paul's mysticism is marked in the first instance by his very freedom from a self-imposed inner tension. He knew nothing of "critism," nothing of "the process of interior pedigree," as analyzed by modern Catholic mystics. He did not hide from the world to meet spiritual communications. He never allowed himself to lapse into self-induced passivity. In "times of the powers" overcome his restless, roving mystic.

If we compare Paul with a great mystic like St. Teresa, (1515-1582), we are forced to declare that he experienced little of what she experienced in her four stages: Meditation, the Prayer of Quiet, the Sleep of the Powers, and the Flight of the Soul. It is the state which Teresa calls "spiritual marriage", in which the purified soul, emerging from these earlier stages, and now partly or entirely free from the accidents of nature, country, dryness, at ease, performs among men the will of God, to which Paul's active life in Christ bears most marked resemblance.

Paul's mysticism took its stand in a great initial experience in which the power of God was revealed and imparted

---

1 Weber, Christus-Mystik, S. 45-6, says

> . . . diese vollkommenste Gestaltung
> für das religiöse Leben des Apostels
> Paulus dauernd ungenügend und unbefriedigt
> blieb.

to him so forcibly, so clearly, that he was compelled henceforth to spend his life in imparting that experience to others. His mysticism has in it elements of unstudied spontaneity and reality. His varying experiences of Christ and in Christ were due not to the assiduous practice of an inner technique, but to the impact of the personality of Christ on a spirit absorbed in human problems and subjected to the pressure of the demands and events of daily life.

A second mark of the mysticism of Paul is his positive attitude toward life in the world. A great many of the mystics of later years renounced the world, withdrew into seclusion, and there sought to cultivate an awareness of and fit their spirits for life in a higher world. Often they took the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, avoided as much as possible human contact, especially with those of the other sex, and indulged in such ascetic practices as were calculated to sharpen their spiritual powers.

By contrast, Paul's mysticism is world-embracing. True, he often projected his own thought and the thought of members of his churches to the world to come; he likewise was impervious to the allurements of riches and worldly position. But this did not prevent his giving himself chiefly to the needs of people in this world. Allowing for the presence of

the eschatological element in his thought in rather marked degree, we may point out that so far as his own personal attitude was concerned, he was exceedingly zealous for the best possible conduct of this life. He touched the lives of men that they might better live here and now. His concern with churches, and with the functions of members of churches, his tireless performance of the duties incident to his missionary labor and to his trade of tent-making, mark him as a mystic whose relationships with the world were normal.

A third mark of Paul's mysticism relates to the divine object of his religious experience. Paul is unique in that he is the first Christian to have developed Christ-mysticism. Paul experienced God not as the "All" or "Absolute" or as "Pure Being", but as Christ. In Paul the mystical experience of God was for the first time conditioned rationally, ethically, historically.[1] Because he conceived and experienced God in the person of Jesus Christ, his mysticism follows personality patterns; the God he experienced was laid hold on in terms of the personality of Christ, - a personality with a definite human history. Thus Paul never conceived himself to be in union with God in the sense that he was absorbed by God,

---

1 W. Douglas Mackenzie, "Jesus Christ," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VII, p. 525.

the cosmological element in his thought is rather marked. Hence, we may point out that so far as his own personal attitude was concerned, he was overwhelmingly zealous for the best possible conduct of this life. He to whom the lives of men that they might better live here and now. His concern with sickness, and with the functions of medicine or charcoal, his tireless performance of the duties incident to his mineralogy labor and to his trade of text-writing, marks him as a mystic whose relationship with the world were normal.

A third work of Saint's speculations relates to the living object of his religious experience. Paul is unique in that he is the first Christian to have developed Christ-mysticism. Paul experienced God not as the "Ain" or "Absolute" or as "Pure Being", but as Christ. In Paul the mystical experience of God was for the first time conditioned rationally, ethically, historically.[1] Because he conceived and experienced God in the person of Jesus Christ, his mysticism follows personality pattern: the God he experienced was laid hold on in terms of the personality of Christ, - a personality with a definite human history. Thus Paul never conceived himself to be in union with God in the sense that he was absorbed by God,

---

1 T. Douglas Kemmerle, "Jesus Christ," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Vol. VII, p. 830.

or deified. His mysticism had in it an active principle; it was fellowship and communion, an interaction of Christ's personality, or of God in and through Christ's personality, with his own. Although many later mystics of the church experienced Christ, Paul is the first to have conditioned his relationship to God in this way.

Fourth, Paul's mystical experience is marked by a double interest: it is both personal and social in character. The intimate personal bond by which Paul was joined to Christ was a shared relationship; there was nothing exclusive about it. As he was in Christ, so all believers were in Christ. His consciousness of participation in a great fellowship was quite as keen as his awareness of being in Christ. The extension of the experience of Christ to the lives of others constitutes a unique characteristic of his mysticism.[1]

Finally, Paul's mysticism is marked by a strong emphasis upon the ethical element. His mysticism was not something other than his ethics; it did not merely issue in ethics, nor merely find outworkings in moral conduct. The ethical

---

1 Weinel comments:

> That is what makes the apostle's mysticism so pure. His only way of experiencing religion is to enter into a great fellowship with others, and to recognize that in all of his fellows the same power is at work, and that every one of them realizes this power in that particular way which makes his life to be of special value to the whole.
> St. Paul, the Man and His Work, p. 132.

or faith. His mysticism had in it an active principle; it was followship and communion, an identification of Christian personality, or of God in and through Christ's personality, with his own. Although many let a portion of the church experience Christ, Paul is the first to have constituted his relationship to God in this way.

Fourth, Paul's mystical experience is marked by a double interest: it is both personal and social in character. The intimate personal bond by which Paul was joined to Christ was a shared relationship; there was nothing exclusive about it. As he was in Christ, so all believers were in Christ. His consciousness of participation in a great fellowship was quite as keen as his awareness of being in Christ. The extension of the experience of Christ to the lives of others constitutes a major characteristic of his mysticism.[1]

Finally, Paul's mysticism is marked by a strong emphasis upon the ethical element. His mysticism was not something other than his ethics; it did not merely issue in ethics, nor merely find outcroppings in moral conduct. The ethical

---

1 Weiss comments:

> That is what makes the apostle's revelations so pure. His only way of experiencing religion is to enter into a great fellowship with others, and to recognize that in all of his fellow this same power is at work, and that everyone of them realizes this power in that particular way which makes his life to be of special value to the whole.
>
> G. Weiss, The Man and His Work, p. 128.

element is part and parcel of his religious experience, and in that experience played a significant role.

> This new form of religious experience can be fully understood only in and through its ethical qualities. 1

Throughout our discussion of the mystical element in Paul we have repeatedly declared it to be personal, dynamic, and functional in character. These terms find their real meaning in the ethical realm. One cannot speak of personal relationships without involving moral relationships, nor of dynamic experience without meaning moral experience, nor of the functions of men and women in Christ without thinking of the moral aspect of the exercise of those functions. Paul's mysticism is so strongly ethical in character that it is impossible to divide the mystical and the ethical in his experience, though it is of course possible to study his experience in terms of the ethical and the mystical elements which inhere in it.

To analyze and characterize the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics is the purpose of this thesis. Our enumeration of the marks of his mysticism completes our study of the mystical element in Paul, and opens the way for consideration of the ethical element.

---

1 Mackenzie, op. cit., p. 524.

element is part and parcel of his religious experience, and in that experience played a significant role.

> This new form of religious experience can be fully understood only in and through its ethical qualities. 1

Throughout our discussion of the mystical element in Buber we have repeatedly declared it to be personal, dynamic, and functional in character. These terms find their real meaning in the ethical real. One cannot speak of personal relationships without involving moral relationships, nor of dynamic experience without assuming moral experience, nor of the functions of men and women in Buber without thinking of the moral aspect of the exercise of those functions. Buber's mysticism is so strongly ethical in character that it is impossible to divide the mystical and the ethical in his experience, though it is of course possible to study his experience in terms of the ethical and the mystical elements which inhere in it.

To analyze and characterize the relation of Buber's mysticism to his ethics is the purpose of this thesis. Our consideration of the nature of his mysticism completes our study of the mystical element in Buber, and opens the way for consideration of the ethical element.

---

1 Bergmann, op. cit., p. 224.

Chapter VI

The Ethical Element in Paul

The ethical element in Paul

The purpose of this chapter is to reveal the ethical element in the experience and teaching of Paul. Our plan is: 1) to take note of the large body of literary material which is concerned with the ethical element; 2) to discover and discuss the factors which gave rise to that element; 3) to mark the range, scope, and interest of Paul's ethics.

Its place in Pauline literature

The large place given by Paul to ethical considerations has been overlooked by many students of the Pauline literature. Paul the religionist has eclipsed Paul the ethical speculator and moral teacher. Without denying the predominance of the religious element, it is essential to the establishment of this thesis to take note of the place given by Paul to ethical considerations, and to appraise its significance.

A surprisingly large part of the subject matter of Paul's letters is ethical in character. We include in the ethical category two types of material: that which reflects the bearing of his personal religious problem upon his own moral experience, and that which deals practically with the moral problems confronting

the members of the Christian communities which he served. Together, these two types of ethical material comprise, roughly, about one half of the letters of Paul. Taking the chapter as the unit, we see that the ethical interest claims the following number of chapters in the letters: Romans, 7; I Corinthians, 10; II Corinthians, 8;[1] Galatians, 2; Ephesians, 3; Philippians, 3; Colossians, 3; I Thessalonians, 3; II Thessalonians, 1; I Timothy, 5; II Timothy, 2; Titus, 3; Philemon, 1. Even though a substantial reduction were made to allow for non-ethical material in many of the chapters counted (51), it is apparent that of the total number of chapters (83), one-half is a fair estimate for the ethical material.

The two types of ethical material, and the conditions which gave rise to them

When we survey this large body of ethical material we find that it lends itself to analysis from the two points of view suggested above: 1) that of his own personal religious experience, 2) that of his practical teaching among his converts.

---

1 Gardner, The Religious Experience of St.Paul, p. 139, says,

> In that Epistle (Romans) he is mainly bent, as in the Corinthian Epistles he is almost entirely bent, upon what is ethical, what has relation to conduct, and to human love and hope. He drifts into a doctrinal discussion, I had almost said a doctrinal slough, because it lies directly in his path. But he is not happy there, nor do I think that he there shows at his best. And it is with obvious relief that he goes back to his ethical exhortation.

Speculation on the religio-ethical problem

First, then, the ethical element appears in relation to the religious consciousness of Paul. When he moved from the religious sphere of Judaism, in which he came to realize the powerlessness of ethical legalism, into the religious sphere of Christianity, where he came into a new life in God through personal relationship to Jesus Christ, Paul's moral experience underwent profound transformation. The reflection of this change is found in Romans and Galatians, chiefly, but also in some of the other epistles. In Romans the first five chapters

> are concerned with the doctrine of Justification in itself (1:16-3:30), in relation to leading features of the Old Covenant (3:31-4:25) and in the consequences which flowed from it (5:1 - 21). [1]

(Justification is an ethico-religious problem, dealing with the righteousness of Christians). Chapters 6 and 7 treat the ethical problem precipitated in Paul's mind by the conflict of law and grace. Chapter 8 deals with the contrast between life according to the flesh and life in the Spirit. The same group of religio-ethical problems finds treatment in II Cor 3:4-11; in Gal 2:15-21 justification by faith receives succinct and illuminating expression; Gal 3:5-22 reverts again to the problem of the law; and Gal 5:23-29 restates the doctrine of justification. Gal 4:1-7, 21-31, 5:2-6 repeat this sequence; Gal 5:16 amplifies in

---

1 Sanday and Headlam, "Romans," (I C C) pp. 37-38.

Speculation on the religio-ethical theme

First, here, the ethical element appears in relation to the religious edaphrumoses of Paul. Then he moved from the real less sphere of dadaism, in which he came to realize the nonsubstance of ethical legalism, into the religious sphere of christianity, where he came into a new life in God through personal relationship to Jesus Christ. Paul's moral experience underwent profound transformation. The realization of this change is found in Romans and Galatians, chiefly, but also in some of the other epistles. In Romans the first five chapters

> are concerned with the doctrine of justification by faith (1:16-5:20), in relation to ideology features of the old covenant (3:21-4:25) and in the correspondence which flowed from it (3:1 - 21).[1]

(Justification is an ethico-religious problem, dealing with the righteousness of christianity). Chapters 6 and 7 treat the ethical problem precipitated in Paul's mind by the conflict of law and grace. Chapter 8 deals with the contrast between life according to the flesh and life in the spirit. The core theme of religio-ethical problems finds treatment in 12 cor 5:-11: in Gal 2:16-21 justification by faith, receive substance and illuminating expressions; Gal 3:6-22 reverts again to the problem of the law; and Gal 3:23-29 restates the doctrine of justification. Gal 4: 1-7, 21-31, 5:2-6 repeat this sequence; Gal 5:16 amplifies in

---

1 Tenney and Goodspeed, "Romans," (I C C) pp. 27-28.

more practical form Romans 8. In the shorter epistles references to this deep-going religio-ethical problem are not wanting, e.g., Eph 2:1-18, especially verses 5,8,14-18. Thus we see what a large part of Paul's letters was devoted to this first type of ethical interest.

Practical moral teaching

A correspondingly large place was given by Paul in his letters to moral instruction and admonition of a very practical sort. How is the appearance of this widely scattered body of ethical material to be explained? The answer lies in an appreciation of Paul's purpose, and an understanding of the background of the people to whom he wrote.

Paul's apostleship involved as its first function the preaching of the gospel. His main objective, as he visited communities for the first time, was to sow the seed of the Christian faith. The first visits he made to Galatia, Ephesus, Colossae, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Corinth were devoted to preaching and teaching the gospel, establishing the Christian communities, and training leaders. But once the churches were established, an entirely different set of labors demanded his attention. These new converts who entered the Christian fellowship were products of a Graeco-Roman civilization. The moral standards of that civilization were low, and violation of even low standards was common. The religions of the Greeks invoked no high moral

more practical form Romans 8. In the shorter epistles references to this deep-going religio-ethical problem are not wanting, e.g., eph 2:1-16, especially verses 8,9,14-18. Thus we see that a large part of Paul's labors was devoted to this first type of ethical teaching.

Practical moral teaching — A correspondingly large place was given by Paul in his letters to moral instruction and admonition of a very practical sort. How is the apparence of this widely neglected body of ethical material to be explained? The answer lies in an appreciation of Paul's purpose, and an understanding of the background of the people to whom he wrote.

Paul's sportleadship involved as the first consideration the preaching of the gospel. His main objective, as he viewed communities for the first time, was to sow the seed of the Christian faith. The first visits he made to Galatia, Corinth, Colossae, Philippi, Thessalonica, and Ephesus were devoted to preaching and teaching the gospel, establishing the Christian communities, and training leaders. But once the churches were established, an entirely different sort of labors demanded his attention. Those new converts who entered the Christian fellowship were products of a Greco-Roman civilization. The moral standards of that civilization were low, and violation of even low standards was common. The religions of the Greeks leveled no high moral

sanctions, exerted but slight pressure on their devotees to live moral lives. Stoicism, though highly developed ethically, was impotent to enforce its moral precepts. Epicureanism, while magnifying the aesthetic values, was powerless to prevent the appreciation of the sensuous from degenerating into the indulgence of the sensual. The Greek dieties, never seriously regarded, exercised little ethical authority.[1] The Mystery Religions were intent upon the performance of rites, and the cultivation of an esoteric fellowship which was impervious, at least in practice, to moral demands.

Ethical libertinism reigned throughout the Graeco-Roman world.[2] A low estimate of the worth of human life led on the one hand to bestiality, cruelty, and violence toward others, and on the other to forms of self-degradation often culminating in suicide. Gross indulgence of the physical appetites, drunkenness, sexual perversion and promiscuity flourished. Domestic relations were lightly held and easily broken. Deceit and disloyalty were commonplaces of a loose social life.

When converts with a moral background of this sort entered the Christian fellowship, the shock of re-creation wrought in them immediate moral changes. They were "new creatures" in Christ Jesus. They shared a corporate fellowship; they partook

---

1 S. Angus, The Environment of Early Christianity, pp. 60-61.

2 Ibid, pp. 37-51.

sanctions, exerted but slight pressure on their devotees to live moral lives. Stoicism, though highly developed ethically, was impotent to conserve its moral precepts. Epicureanism, while justifying the sensibile values, was powerless to prevent the aggression of the sensuous free dispensating into the indulgence of the carnal. The Greek dictum, never seriously regarded, exercised little ethical authority.[1] The mystery religions were intent upon the performance of rites, and the multiplication of an esoteric fellowship which was immortalous, at least in practice, to moral demands.

Ethical liberalism reigned throughout the Greco-Roman world.[2] A lax religion of the world of human life lay on the one hand to bestiality, cruelty, and violence toward others, and on the other to form of self-degradation often culminating in suicide. Gross indulgence of the physical appetites, drunkenness, sexual perversion and promiscuity flourished. Domestic relations were highly laid and easily broken. Deceit and disloyalty were commonplace of a loose social life.

When confronted with a moral background of this sort underlaid the Christian fellowship, the shock of re-creation proved in them immediate moral changes. They were "new creatures" in Christ Jesus. They observed a corporate fellowship; they practiced

---

1 W. Barclay, The Environment of Early Christianity, p. 60-61.

2 Ibid., pp. 57-61.

of the "body of Christ." But their rise to the "stature of the fulness of Christ"[1] was no automatic response to mystical experience. Not at once could they shake off the moral habits of a life-time. Relapses into paganism were frequent. Drunkenness, fornication, recrimination, brawls, incest - these eruptions of the "old man" broke the peace and power of their new relationship with Christ. Moreover, they were subjected to the proselyting efforts of false teachers who sought to lure them from the rudiments of their new faith, and encouraged them to lay hold of that "new wisdom" which permitted relaxation of moral vigilance. They were perplexed by problems growing out of their relationship to companions who were still shackled by paganism. The ordinary necessities of eating and drinking were complicated on the one hand by the customs of the pagan cults, and on the other by the new conception of the common meal as a sharing of the body and blood of Christ. Even their personal relationship to their spiritual father, Paul, was menaced morally by insinuations of idle, gossiping men.

As the founder of these new communities, Paul was in constant touch with them. Reports of disorder, backsliding, moral relapse, and personal disloyalty were brought to him by his fellow-workers. His responsibility for their welfare became more demanding. He had sown the seed, he had cultivated the soil, he and his

---

1 Eph 4:13.

of the "body of Christ." But their rise to the "stature of the fulness of Christ"[1] was no automatic response to spiritual experience. Not at once could they shake off the moral habits of a life-time. Relapses into paganism were frequent. Drunkenness, fornication, mendicancy, wrath, lust - these or sins of the "old man" broke the peace and power of their new relationship with Christ. Moreover, they were subjected to the proselyting efforts of false teachers who sought to lure them from the rudiments of their new faith, and encouraged them to lay hold of that "new wisdom" which permitted relaxation of moral vigilance. They were perplexed by problems growing out of their relationship to companions who were still shackled by paganism. The ordinary necessities of eating and drinking were complicated on the one hand by the customs of the pagan cults, and on the other by the new conception of the common meal as a sharing of the body and blood of Christ. Even their personal relationship to their spiritual leaders, Paul, was menaced morally by institutions of Hellenizing men.

As the founder of these new communities, Paul was in constant touch with them. Reports of disorder, backslidings, moral relapses, and personal disloyalty were brought to him by his fellow-workers. His responsibility for their welfare became more demanding. He had sown the seed, he had cultivated the soil, he and his

---

1 Eph 4:13.

fellow-workers had nurtured the young plants. He must by all means present them "perfect in Christ."[1] So he plied them with letters, or paid them hurried visits, correcting abuses, reestablishing faith, and winning back their lost confidence in himself. His letters bristle with moral admonitions; he reproves, commands, entreats; he directs their action in dealing with all violators of the moral law of the new fellowship; he vindicates his apostleship under fire.

Out of such concrete dealings with his new converts the moral teaching of Paul took its rise. Manifestly it cannot be regarded as a system of ethics. Paul was no academician, deducing a moral code from theoretical ethical principles. He was a Christian pastor and teacher, faced with the strenuous yet delicate task of holding his converts in line. His whole intent was practical. The moral teaching of his letters is of a practical nature. His moral admonitions, pointed directly at human situations in his churches, receive no logical arrangement or orderly development in his letters. They form rather a great moral miscellany, the only unitive principle of which is Paul's personal relationship with those to whom his precepts were offered.

The greater part of what we have called the ethical material in Paul is of this practical, immediate character.

---

1 Col 1:28, 4:12.

fellow-workers had nurtured the young plants. He had by all means greeted them "perfect in Christ", supplied them with letters, or paid them buried visits, corrected abuses, reestablished order, and winning back their lost confidence in himself. His letters bristle with moral admonitions: he reproves, commends, entreats; he directs their action in dealing with all violators of the moral law of the new fellowship; he vindicates his apostolically paternal.

One of such concrete dealings with his new converts the moral teaching of Paul took its rise. Manifestly it cannot be regarded as a system of ethics. Paul was no moralician, deducing a moral code from theoretical ethical principles. He was a Christian pastor and teacher, faced with the enormous yet delicate task of holding his converts in line. His whole interest was practical. The moral teaching of his letters is of a practical nature. His moral admonitions, pointed directly at human shortcomings in his churches, reveals no logical arrangement or orderly development in his letters. They form rather a fresh moral miscellany. The only unifying principle of action is Paul's personal relationship with those to whom his precepts were offered.

The greater part of what we have called the ethical material in Paul is of this character, however.

---

1 Col 1:28, etc.

Romans and Galatians contain, as we have pointed out, considerable discussion of the ethical element from the speculative angle. But even Romans contains a large body of practical moral teaching. In the two Corinthian letters, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, the Thessalonian letters, and the Pastorals, the practical moral teaching predominates.

The scope of Paul's practical moral teaching is as broad as life itself. This fact finds illustration in Paul's use of the term περιπατέω, which he employs not in the literal sense of physical locomotion, but in the figurative sense of conduct of life.[1] The occurence of this term 33 times in his letters indicates Paul's concern for the total moral behavior of the individual. Paul exhorts his readers to walk (conduct themselves) becomingly,[2] orderly,[3] worthily of God,[4] as pleasing God,[5] by faith, not by sight,[6] not in craftiness, nor deceitfully,[7] nor according to the flesh,[8] nor as the Gentiles,[9] but in love,[10] in wisdom,[11] as children of light,[12] and by the Spirit.[13] Thus by the varied uses to which he puts this single term, Paul suggests the all-embracing scope of his ethical

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), pp. 297-298, says of περιπατέω (περιπατεῖτε)

> . . . it is a true imperative in force . . . denoting action in progress. . . Paul enjoins them to continue to govern their conduct by the inward impulse of the Spirit.

2 Rom 13:13, I Thes 4:12. 3 II Thes 3:11. 4 I Thes 2:12, Eph 4:1.

5 I Thes 4:1. 6 II Cor 5:7. 7 II Cor 4:2. 8 II Cor 10:2,4; Gal 5:16.

9 Eph 4:17. 10 Eph 5:2. 11 Eph 5:15-16. 12 Eph 5:9.

13 II Cor 12:18; Gal 5:16, 25.

Romans and Galatians models, as we have pointed out, considerable dissociation of the ethical element from the spectacular merits, but even Romans contains a large body of practical moral teaching. In the two Corinthian letters, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, the Thessalonian letters, and the Pastorals, the practical moral teaching predominates.

The scope of Paul's practical moral teaching is as broad as life itself. This fact finds illustration in Paul's use of the term Nomos (Law), which he employs not in the literal sense of physical locomotion, but in the figurative sense of conduct of life.[1] The occurrence of this term 23 times in his letters indicates Paul's concern for the moral behavior of the individual. Paul exhorts his readers to walk (conduct themselves) becomingly,[2] orderly,[3] worthily of God,[4] as pleasing God,[5] by faith, not by sight,[6] not in craftiness, nor deceitfully,[7] nor according to the flesh,[8] nor as the Gentiles,[9] but in love,[10] in wisdom,[11] as children of light,[12] and by the Spirit.[13] Thus by the varied uses to which he puts this simple term, Paul expands the all-embracing scope of his ethical

---

1. Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), pp. 527-528, says of Nomos (Law) (Gal. 5:23):

> . . . It is a term frequently in Paul . . . denoting action in progress. . . . Paul employs Nomos in connection to cover their conduct by the inward impulse of the Spirit.

2. Rom 13:13, 1 Thes 4:12. 3 1 Thes 3:11. 4 1 Thes 2:12, Eph 4:1.

5 1 Thes 4:1. 6 2 Cor 5:7. 7 2 Cor 4:2. 8 2 Cor 10:2,4; Gal 5:16.

9 Eph 4:17. 10 Eph 5:2. 11 Col 4:5-6. 12 Eph 5:8.

13 2 Cor 12:18; Gal 5:16, 25.

interest. The moral transformation of believers can stop at nothing short of the whole life.

Within this broad scope, Paul's moral teaching deals with an infinite variety of subjects. The various lists of vices and virtues compiled by Paul present a formidable array of ethical material, and demonstrate the range of his moral interest.

Vices

Gal 5:19-21.	Rom 1:24-32. (of the Gentiles)	II Tim 3:2-11.
fornication	lust	self-love
uncleanness	uncleanness	love of money
lasciviousness	vile passions	boasting
idolatry	homosexuality	haughtiness
sorcery	unrighteousness	railing
enmities	wickedness	disobedience
strife	covetousness	thanklessness
jealousies	maliciousness	unholiness
wraths	envy	lack of natural affection
factions	murder	implacability
divisions	strife	slander
parties	deceit	lack of self-control
envyings	malignity	fierceness
drunkenness	whispering	no love of the good
revellings	back-biting	treachery
	hate to God	headstrongness
	insolence	vanity
	haughtiness	love of pleasure
	boasting	lust
	evil invention	corruption of mind
	disobedience	
	ignorance	
	covenant-breaking	
	unmercifulness	
	lack of natural affection	

These lists are paralleled and augmented by those in II Cor 12:20-21; I Cor 5:11, 6:9-10; Eph 4:17-22, 5:2-5; I Tim 1:9-10, 6:4; Col 3:5-8.

interest. The moral transformation of believers can also not nothing short of the whole life.

Within this broad scope, Paul's moral teaching deals with an infinite variety of subjects. Two various lists of vices and virtues compiled by Paul present a formidable array of ethical material, and demonstrate the range of his moral interest.

Vices

Gal 5:19-21.	Rom 1:24-32. (of the Gentiles)	II Tim 3:2-4.
fornication	lust	self-love
uncleanness	uncleanness	love of money
lasciviousness	vile passions	boasting
idolatry	homosexuality	boastfulness
sorcery	unrighteousness	railing
enmities	wickedness	disobedience
strife	covetousness	thanklessness
jealousies	malicious	unholiness
wrathes	envy	lack of natural
factions	murder	affection
divisions	strife	implacability
parties	deceit	slander
envyings	malignity	lack of self-control
drunkenness	whispering	fierceness
revellings	back-biting	no love of the good
	hate to God	treachery
	insolence	headstrongness
	haughtiness	vanity
	boasting	love of pleasure
	evil inventions	lust
	disobedience	corruption of mind
	ignorance	
	covenant-breaking	
	unmercifulness	
	lack of natural affection	

These lists are paralleled and supported by those in II Cor 12:20-21; I Cor 6:11, 6:9-10; Eph 4:17-22, 5:3-5; I Tim 1:9-10, also; Col 3:5-.

Virtues

Gal 5:19-24.		Eph 4:25-32.	Phil 4:8.
love	faithfulness	truth-speaking	things honorable
joy	meekness	labor	things just
peace	self-control	edifying speech	things pure
long-suffering		kindness	things lovely
kindness		tenderheartedness	things of good report
goodness		forgiveness	

Additional lists of virtues appear in Eph 4:2; II Cor 6:4-10; Col 3:12-16; I Tim 6:11.

These informal catalogues of vices and virtues indicate the variety and range of Paul's practical moral teaching.

Growth of the moral life

From another point of view, Paul's practical teaching reflects an interest in the growth of the moral life, the progressive advancement of the individual from moral rudiments to the full-blown moral personality. He sees the believer rooted in love,[1] and striving to grow up unto Christ in all things.[2] His use of the term καρπος suggests growth, maturity, and fruitage.[3] Organic growth is suggested also by the comparison of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ to the human body, growing into the stature of the fulness of Christ.[4] The Corinthians he regards as babes who can be nurtured only on baby-food, not yet on meat.[5] Only a constant renewal of the inner man[6] will suffice for the achievement of moral perfection.

---

1 Phil 3:8.

2 Eph 4:15.

3 Gal 5:22, Rom 6:22.

4 Eph 4:11-15.

5 I Cor 3:2.

6 II Cor 4:16, Col 3:9-11.

Virtue

Gal 5:19-23. Eph 4:25-32. Phil 4:8.

love	faithfulness	truth-speaking	things honorable
joy	meekness	labor	things just
peace	self-control	edifying speech	things pure
long-suffering		kindness	things lovely
kindness		tender-hearted love	things of good
goodness		forgiveness	report

Additional lists of virtues appear in Eph 4:3; 1 Cor 4:6-10; Col 3:12-15; 1 Tim 6:11.

These informal catalogues of virtue and virtuous indicate the variety and range of Paul's practical moral teaching.

Growth of the moral life

From another point of view, Paul's practical teaching reflects an interest in the growth of the moral life. The progressive advancement of the individual from moral rudiments to the full-blown moral personality. He sees the believer rooted in love,[1] and striving to grow up into Christ in all things.[2] His use of the term καρπός suggests growth, maturity, and fruitage.[3] Organic growth is suggested also by the comparison of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ to the human body, growing into the stature of the fullness of Christ.[4] The Corinthians are reproved as babes who can be nurtured only on milk-food, not yet on meat.[5] Only a gradual removal of the inner man[6] will suffice for the achievement of moral perfection.

---

1 Phil 2:2. 2 Eph 4:15.

3 Gal 5:22, Rom 6:22. 4 Eph 4:11-16.

5 1 Cor 3:2. 6 2 Cor 4:16, Col 3:9-11.

Though it is God who begins the good work in men,[1] men must cooperate with God in advancing the new life. This is accomplished through self-purification,[2] through striving for maturity in knowledge,[3] in mastery over the body,[4] in sobriety,[5] in chastity,[6] in self-restraint.[7]

This striving for the new life is compared by Paul to a warfare;[8] he refers to the soldier's foes: the flesh,[9] the rulers of darkness and the spiritual hosts of wickedness,[10] the wiles and snares of the devil;[11] to combat these the soldier must put on his battle-equipment.[12] He also likens the moral struggle to a race,[13] and to a boxing-contest.[14]

In this essential process of growth, all things work together for good to them that love God. Paul looks upon the changing vicissitudes of life as

> "Machinery just meant
> To give thy soul its bent,
> Try thee and turn thee forth, sufficiently
> impressed."[15]

Life's hard experiences possess disciplinary value.[16]

---

1 Col 1:12, II Thes 2:13. 2 II Cor 7:1.

3 I Cor 15:20, 3:18; Col 1:10, 2:8; Eph 5:8, 10, 17; Gal 5:1.

4 II Tim 1:7. 5 II Tim 4:5; I Thes 4:11.

6 I Cor 7:18. 7 Phil 4:12. 8 II Tim 4:7.

9 Gal 5:17. 10 Eph 6:12. 11 Eph 6:11; II Tim 2:26.

12 Eph 6. 13 I Cor 9:24. 14 Rom 8:28.

15 Robert Browning, "Rabbi Ben Ezra." 16 II Cor 4:8-18.

Though it is God who begins the good work in man,[1] man must cooperate with God in advancing the new life. This is accomplished through self-purification,[2] through strengthening in knowledge,[3] in mastery over the body,[4] in solidity,[5] in charity,[6] in well-rounded.[7]

This striving for the new life is compared by Paul to a warfare;[8] he refers to the soldier's fear: the flesh,[9] the rulers of darkness and the spiritual hosts of wickedness,[10] the wiles and snares of the devil;[11] as a sort that does the soldier such on his battle-equipment.[12] He also likens the moral struggle to a race,[13] and to a boxing-contest.[14]

In this essential process of growth, all things work together for good to them that love God. Paul looks upon the changing vicissitudes of life as

> "ministering just enough
> to give thy soul its food,
> by thee and your time form, sufficiently
> increased."[15]

Life's very experiences possess disciplinary value.[16]

---

1. Col 1:12, 21 Thes 3:13.
2. 1 Cor 15:20, 7:18; Col 1:10, 3:9; Eph 5:9, 10, 17; Col 3:1.
3. 1 Cor 1:7.
4. 1 Cor 7:12.
5. 1 Cor 7:15.
6. Col 3:17.
7. 2 Tim 3:17.
8. 1 Tim 1:18; 2 Tim 2:3.
9. 2 Tim 2:22.
10. Eph 6:12.
11. Eph 6:11; 1 Tim 3:20.
12. Eph 6.
13. 1 Cor 9:24.
14. 1 Cor 9:25.
15. Robert Browning, "Abbt Ben Ezra."
16. 2 Cor 4:8-12.

Thus temptation is an avenue leading to moral strength. No temptation is unbearable;[1] God employs temptation to test the Christian's faith.[2] Growth in the moral life involves the progressive conquest of sin.

So with suffering: it possesses potential moral value. Paul's thorn in the flesh contributed to his moral strength.[3] The suffering occasioned by the loss of all things opened the way to the gaining of Christ.[4] Believers commend themselves to God by their patience in sufferings,

> in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings.[5]

Through Christ they may transform untoward circumstances into positive moral values: evil report to good report, deceit to truth.[6] They may be chastened, but not killed; sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; poor, yet rich; impoverished, yet possessing all things.[7] Neither prosperity nor adversity can add to or take from Paul's abundant life:

> I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, there in to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in every thing and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want.[8]

---

1 I Cor 10:13. 2 Rom 7. 3 II Cor 12:7-10.

4 Phil 3:7-8. 5 II Cor 6:4-5. 6 II Cor 6:8-9.

7 II Cor 6:9-10. 8 Phil 4:11-12.

Thus temptation is an avenue leading to moral strength. No temptation is unbearable;[1] God employs temptation to test the Christian's faith.[2] Growth in the moral life involves the progressive conquest of sin.

So with suffering: it possesses potential moral value. Paul's thorn in the flesh contributed to his moral strength.[3] The struggle occasioned by the loss of all things proved a way to the gaining of Christ.[4] Believers commend themselves to God by their patience in sufferings.

> in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in scourges, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings.[5]

Though whilst they may transform unknown circumstances into positive moral values: evil reports to good reports, deceit to truth.[6] They may be chastened, but not killed; sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; poor, yet make many rich; yet possessing all things.[7] Neither prosperity nor adversity can fail to be turn their Lord's abundant life:

> I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know also how to abound: in every thing and in all things have I learned the secret both to be filled and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want.[8]

---

1 I Cor 10:13. 2 Mom 7. 3 II Cor 12:7-10.

4 Phil 3:7-8. 5 II Cor 6:4-5. 6 II Cor 6:8-9.

7 II Cor 6:9-10. 8 Phil 4:11-12.

Daily work was regarded as a distinct opportunity for the cultivation and exercise of the moral nature. Spurned by the higher classes in the Roman world as fit only for slaves, labor was elevated by Paul to a position of moral dignity and power. He himself worked with his hands, and thus maintained his economic independence.[1] He denounces idleness and sloth. He enjoins the Thessalonians, who were inclined to lay aside their daily work in the expectation of the speedy return of the Lord, to take it up again.[2] Work was in Paul's view a conditioning experience for higher service.[3]

The moral growth of the Christian is aided by self-applied methods of an inner sort. Paul exhorts his believers to examine themselves, try themselves, prove themselves and their work;[4] he encourages them to watchfulness[5] and prayer,[6] even as he also watches and prays.

In Paul's practical moral teaching, therefore, the long, severe, costly process of growth plays an important role. The moral individual, renewed day by day, must forge on toward the fullgrown stature of Christ. And the corporate fellowship to which each individual belongs must grow up into the body of

---

1 II Thes 3:8. 2 I Thes 4:11. 3 II Tim 2:15-21.

4 II Cor 13:5; I Thes 5:21-22. 5 Col 4:2.

6 Gal 6:6; I Thes 3:9; II Cor 1:10; I Thes 1:2.

Daily work was regarded as a divinely appointed duty for the cultivation and enrichment of the moral nature. Spurred by the higher ideals in the Roman world as gift duty for slaves, labor was elevated by Paul to a position of moral dignity and power. He himself worked with his hands, and thus maintained his economic independence.[1] He commended idleness and sloth. He enjoins the Thessalonians, who were inclined to lay aside their daily works in the expectation of the speedy return of the Lord, to take it up again.[2] Work was in Paul's view a sanctifying experience for higher service.[3]

The moral growth of the Christian is aided by self-applied methods of an inner sort. Paul exhorts his believers to examine themselves, try themselves, prove themselves and their work;[4] he encourages them to watchfulness[5] and prayer,[6] even as he also watches and prays.

In Paul's ethical moral teaching, therefore, the inner, severer, costly process of growth plays an important role. The moral individual, renewed day by day, must work on toward the fullness stature of Christ. And the corporate fellowship to which each individual belongs must grow up into the body of

---

1 I Thes 2:9. 2 I Thes 4:11. 3 II Tim 2:21-22.

4 II Cor 13:5; I Thes 5:21-22. 5 Col 4:2.

6 Gal 6:9; I Thes 3:9; II Cor 1:10; I Thes 1:2.

Christ. For Paul is as greatly concerned with social as with individual morality. The personal moral probity of the individual must be matched by the cultivation of love, the bond of perfectness, within which members of the fellowship show due regard for each other's welfare, returning good for evil, and manifesting toward each other attitudes of forgiveness, forbearance, sympathy, hospitality, and peace. To the moral aspects of social relationships such as the family, the church, and the state, Paul devotes grave attention.

The source of Paul's ethics

What was the source of Paul's ethics? Where did he get his moral standards? As a citizen of the first century, Paul might have drawn upon a number of religio-ethical streams which flowed through the Graeco-Roman culture of his day. There, for example, was the stream of Stoicism. How largely did Paul draw upon ethics of the Stoics?

Stoicism[1] was really not so much a religion or a philosophy as a great humanitarian movement which injected into the common life of the Graeco-Roman world some of its strongest moral conceptions. It proclaimed the dignity of human nature, the brotherhood of man, and the duty of conforming life to the orderly processes of the visible universe. Insofar as these ethical ideals were fused

---

1 Stoicism - Vide Angus, Environment of Early Christianity, pp.113-117; "Stoics," R.D. Hicks, Encyclopedia Brittanica, 11th Ed., Vol 25;pp.942-951; "Stoicism," Weber, A., and Perry, R.B., History of Philosophy, (Eng. tr. of Weber's part by Frank Thilly) N.Y: Scribner, 1925; pp. 106-112.

Christ. For Paul is so greatly concerned with social as with individual moral life. The personal moral reality of the individual must be touched by the conviction of love, the bond of perfectness, within which members of the fellowship show the regard for each other's welfare, refusing good for evil, and manifesting forward each other attitudes of forgiveness, forbearance, sympathy, hospitality, and peace. To the moral aspects of social relationships such as the family, the church, and the state, Paul devotes grave attention.

The source of Paul's ethics

Where was the source of Paul's ethics? Where did he get his moral standards?

As a citizen of the first century, Paul might have drawn upon a number of religio-ethical streams which flowed through the cosmopolitan culture of his day. There, for example, was the stream of Stoicism. How largely did Paul draw upon ethics of the Stoics?

Stoicism[1] was really not so much a religion or a philosophy as a great humanitarian movement which injected into the common life of the Greco-Roman world some of its strongest moral aspirations. It proclaimed the dignity of human nature, the brotherhood of man, and the duty of conducting life in the orderly processes of the visible universe. Insofar as these ethical ideals were fused

---

1 Stoicism - Vide Angus, Environment of Early Christianity, p. 111-117; "Stoics," J. H. Hyde, Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed., vol 25, p. 478-481; "Stoicism," Weber, A., and Perry, T. A., History of Philosophy, (Trans. W. S. Weber's part by Perry, T. A.) N.Y. Scribner, 1925; p. 100-112.

with the common morality of the age, every man was debtor to the Stoics. Tarsus, the city of Paul's birth, was a center of Stoic learning; many of the more prominent Stoics, among whom Chrysippus and Aratus may be named, were, like Paul, Cilicians. It is therefore natural to suppose that Paul was subject to Stoic influence.

There are certain points of resemblance between Paul's ethical ideas and those of the Stoics. Paul uses Stoic phrases; looks upon vice as the Stoic looked upon it; emphasizes the inwardness of ethical life in Stoic fashion. So notable are the resemblances between Paul's ethics and those of Seneca that a spurious series of letters between the two great contemporaries has been invented. The marked parallelism between the ethical teaching of the Pauline letters and that of Stoicism has been ably demonstrated by Bishop Lightfoot,[1] and need not be repeated here. Among the Pauline phrases which are reminiscent of Stoic teaching are those in I Cor 9:25, 15:28; Rom 11:28; II Cor 6:8-10, 12:15. The quotation in Acts 17:28,

> As certain of your own poets have said;
> 'For we are also his offspring' (Cleanthes)

has often been cited to show Paul's familiarity with Stoicism.

But these parallelisms and allusions fall far short of establishing the dependence of Paul upon the Stoics for his ethics. They prove neither that he studied Stoic ethics nor borrowed from them. What phrases he uses he may well have appropriated from common

---

1 Dissertations on the Apostolic Age, pp. 247-316.

with the common morality of the age, every man was debtor to the Stoics. Therefore, the city of Paul's birth, was a seed bed of Stoic learning; many of the more prominent Stoics, among whom Chrysippus and Arrian may be named, were, like Paul, Cilicians. It is therefore natural to suppose that Paul was subject to Stoic influence.

There are certain points of resemblance between Paul's ethical ideas and those of the Stoics. Paul uses Stoic phrases; looks upon vice as the Stoic looked upon it; emphasizes the importance of ethical life in Stoic fashion. So notable are the resemblances between Paul's ethics and those of Seneca that a curious series of letters between the two great contemporaries has been invented. The marked parallelism between the ethical teaching of the genuine letters and that of Epictetus has been ably demonstrated by Fellow Lightfoot,[1] and need not be repeated here. Among the familiar phrases which are reminiscent of Stoic teaching are those in 1 Cor 8:26, 15:28; Rom 11:32; 11 Cor 6:8-10, 13:15. The quotation in Acts 17:28.

In certain of your own poets have said;
'For we are also his offspring' (Cleanthus)

has often been cited to show Paul's familiarity with Stoicism.

But these parallelisms and allusions fall far short of establishing the dependence of Paul upon the Stoics for his ethics. They prove neither that he studied Stoic ethics nor borrowed from them. That phrases he uses he may well have appropriated from common

---

1 Dissertations on the Apostolic age, pp. 327-31n.

usage and employed out of context. For Paul's ethics is in active contrast to Stoic ethics at too many points to allow for conscious dependence.[1] A single illustration of that contrast may be cited in the treatment which Seneca and Paul give to worldly misfortune.

> 'What then?' says Seneca; 'is it death, bonds, fire, all the shafts of fortune that the sage will fear? Not he. He knows that all these are not real, but only apparent evils. He regards them all as mere terrors to human life.'
>
> Infinitely different is the feeling of Paul:
>
> 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us.' The philosopher rises above calamity by firmness of resolve: the Christian soars above it on the wings of love.[2]

Our conclusion regarding possible dependence of Paul upon Stoicism is that there is no evidence of conscious borrowing. That he drew upon the noblest ethical ideals of the time, to which Stoicism made an undoubted contribution, is evident. But in no sense can we speak of Stoicism as the direct source of Paul's new ethical life and teaching.

The Mystery Religions and Paul's ethics

Could the Mystery Religions have provided Paul with his ethical principles or moral precepts? At this point the question arises, What was the moral character of the Mystery Religions? Did they produce a high type

---

1 Enslin, The Ethics of Paul, p. 38 ff.

2 P.Gardner, The Religious Experience of St. Paul, pp. 142-143.

sage and employed only of conduct. For Paul's ethics is in motive contrast to Stoic ethics as too heavy points to allow for possible dependence.[1] A single illustration of that contrast may be cited in the treatment which Seneca and Paul give to worldly misfortune.

> 'Let death' says Seneca; 'let it decide, bonds, fire, all the assaults of fortune that the sage will fear. Not he, I mean that all these are not evil, but only apparent evil. So regards them all as mere terrors to human life.'

Infinitely different is the feeling of Paul:

> 'Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or anguish, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through him that loved us. The principalities rise above or hardly by firmness of resolve; the Christian moves above it on the wings of love.'[2]

Our conclusion regarding possible dependence of Paul upon Stoicism is that there is no evidence of conscious borrowing. That he drew upon the noblest ethical ideals of the time, to which Stoicism made an undoubted contribution, is evident. But in no sense can we speak of Stoicism as the direct source of Paul's new ethical life and teaching.

The Mystery Religions and Paul's ethics — Could the Mystery Religions have provided Paul with his ethical motive for or moral precepts? At this point the question arises, What was the moral character of the Mystery Religions? Did they produce a high type

---

1 Conlin, The Stoics of Paul, p. 83 ff.

2 Barker, The Religious Experience of St. Paul, pp. 142-143.

of moral life in their converts?

It is difficult to answer this question directly and unequivocally. One of the chief tasks of the Mystery Religions seems to have been the education of men in the doctrine of the future life.

> The means of attaining that immortal life in the Mysteries were for the most part ceremonial and often too external to touch the springs of conduct, so that a saved man was not necessarily a moral man. . . It would run counter to our evidence and to what we know of human nature to deny that there were conversions and transformations of character among the members of the Mystery-brotherhoods.[1]

Nevertheless, there is great difference of opinion among scholars as to the ethical value of the Mysteries. Such scholars as Rohde,[2] Ramsay,[3] and Farnell[4] incline to a deprecatory opinion of the ancient Mysteries. Others, like Glover,[5] Lake,[6] Legge,[7] seem to adopt a neutral or hesitating position, while the great

---

1 S. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 142.

2 Rohde, E., Psyche, Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen, (Tübingen, 1921), II, S. 293.

3 Ramsay, W.M., in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, extra vol. p. 126.

4 Farnell, L. R., The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion, (London, 1912), p. 141.

5 Glover, T.R., Progress in Religion, (London, 1922), pp. 320, 323-330.

6 Lake, K., Earlier Epistles of St. Paul, 2nd ed., (London, 1914), p. 39f.

7 Legge, F., Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, 2 vol., (Cambridge, 1915), I, pp. 22, 81 ff., 145 f.

of moral life in their converts?

It is difficult to answer this question directly and unequivocally. One of the chief tenets of the Mystery Religions seems to have been the advantage of man in the doctrine of the future life.

> The means of attaining that blessed life in the Mysteries were for the most part ceremonial and often too external to touch the springs of conduct, so that a saved man was not necessarily a moral man. . . . It would run counter to our evidence and to what we know of human nature to deny that there were conversions and transformations of character among the members of the Mystery-brotherhoods.[1]

Nevertheless, there is great difference of opinion among scholars as to the ethical value of the Mysteries. Some scholars as Robde,[2] Tarvey,[3] and Farnell[4] incline to a depreciatory estimation of the ancient Mysteries. Others, like Glover,[5] Lake,[6] Legge,[7] seem to adopt a neutral or hesitating position, while the great

---

1 E. Angus, The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 122.

2 Robde, E., Psyche, Seelenkult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen, (Freiburg, 1921), II, p. 295.

3 Tarvey, T.M., in Hastings, Dictionary of the Bible, extra vol. p. 124.

4 Farnell, L. R., The Higher Aspects of Greek Religion, (London, 1912), p. 121.

5 Glover, T.R., Progress in Religion, (London, 1922), pp. 320, 323-330.

6 Lake, K., Early Christian of St. Paul, 2nd ed., (London, 1914), p. 321.

7 Legge, F., Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, 2 vol., (Cambridge, 1915), I, pp. 22, 71 ff., 125 f.

majority hold to a favorable estimate, e.g., Gruppe,[1] Cumont,[2] Kennedy,[3] Anrich,[4] Wobbermin,[5] Dill,[6] Loisy,[7] Jevons,[8] Vollers,[9] Bigg,[10] and Inge.[11]

> There are the usual extremists - those who maintain that the oriental cults compare favorably with Christianity, and that Christianity borrowed lavishly from its competitors, and those who would exalt Christianity by decrying everything outside it. Most writers now recognize that the Mysteries had offensive and unwholesome features together with much that exalted man above the limits of ordinary life and its sin and pain and parting. Had they been so intrinsically bad as some assert it is difficult to account for their wonderful success as missionary religions. They lent themselves too easily to externalism by an exaggerated importance

---

1 Gruppe, O., Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte, (2 vol. Munich, 1906).

2 Cumont, F., Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, (2nd. ed Paris, 1909. Eng. tr. by G. Showermain, Chicago, 1911), pp. XXV, 43.

3 Kennedy, H.A.A., St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, (London, 1913), p. 84.

4 Anrich, G., Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum, (Göttingen, 1894), S. 47 ff.

5 Wobbermin, G., Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Christentums durch das antike Mysterienwesen, (Berlin, 1896), S. 35 ff.

6 Dill, S., Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, (London, 1904, 1911) pp. 554 f., 569 ff., 581 ff., 623 ff.

7 Loisy, A.F., Les Mysteres paiens et le Mystere Chretien, (Paris, 1914, 2nd ed., 1921), pp. 25-206.

8 Jevons, F.B., Introduction to the History of Religion, (6th ed., London, 1914), p. 376.

9 Vollers, K., Die Weltreligionen in ihrem geschichtlichen Zusammenhange, (2nd ed. Jena, 1921).

10 Bigg, C., The Church's Task under the Roman Empire, (Oxford, 1905), pp. 45, 53.

11 Inge, W.R., Christian Mysticism, (London, 1899), p. 351.

majority hold to a favorable estimate, e.g., Gruppe,[1] Osmond,[2] Kennedy,[3] Marich,[4] Nobbermann,[5] Dill,[6] Haley,[7] Devone,[8] Volkert,[9] Rigg,[10] and Inge.[11]

There are the usual extremists - those who maintain that the original sects compare favorably with Christianity, and that Christianity borrowed heavily from its competitors, and those who would crib Christianity by denying everything original in it. Most writers now recognize that the religions had different and unrelated features, yet that they had much that existed then above the limits of ordinary life and its sin and pain and strife. Had they been so individually but as some sought it is difficult to account for their tremendous success as missionary religions. They lost themselves too easily to externalism by an exaggerated importance

---

1 Gruppe, O., Griechische Mythologie und Religionsgeschichte, (2 vol. Munich, 1906).

2 Osmond, J., Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain, (2nd. ed Paris, 1909. Eng. tr. by G. Showerman, Chicago, 1911), pp. xiv, 63.

3 Kennedy, J.A., St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, (London, 1913), p. 3.

4 Marich, G., Das erste Jahrhundert in seinen Einflüssen auf das Christentum, (Rostock, 1904), p. 47 ff.

5 Nobbermann, G., Religionsgeschichtliche Studien zur Frage der Beeinflussung des Christentums durch das erste Jahrhundert, (Leipzig, 1896), p. 39 ff.

6 Dill, S., Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius, (London, 1905, [1911]) pp. 394 ff., 399 ff., 421 ff., 623 ff.

7 Haley, A.F., Les Pythagoras peints et le Pythagore Dieu-Homme, (Paris, 1916, 2nd ed., 1921), pp. 23-229.

8 Devone, F.J., Introduction to the History of Religion, (4th ed., London, 1914), p. 374.

9 Volkert, W., Die Heilsmythen in ihrer gegenwärtigen Zusammenhang, (2nd ed. Jena, 1921).

10 Rigg, W.G., The Church's Task Under the Roman Empire, (Oxford, 1905), pp. 49, 55.

11 Inge, W.R., Christian Mysticism, (London, 1899), p. 301.

> of ritual; they awakened a religion exaltation such as has rarely appeared in religious history, but with which ethical considerations were not of primary interest; they confused the physical symbol and the religious experience. But they succeeded in an aggressively religious and serious age, which proves that they were able in some degree to satisfy religious longings. . . In estimating these cults we must weigh their merits as well as their defects, but we must also finally adjudicate upon them, as we would upon Christianity, by their ideals. 'The Mysteries,' says Professor Gardner, (The Ephesian Gospel, p.15) 'had a better aspect in that they taught of deliverance from impurity and of a life beyond the tomb, and a worse aspect, in that they opened the way to superstition, to materialism, and to magic.'[1]

Angus' thoroughgoing study demonstrates that there were both values and disvalues, good and bad moral elements in the Mysteries. This conclusion is significant for our study of Paul's ethics. The direct influence of the Mysteries on Paul is seriously contested by modern scholars. Though many admit that Paul used terms common to the Mysteries, and was therefore unconsciously debtor to them,[2] few take the position that he deliberately appropriated the religious or moral doctrines and ideals of the Mysteries. It may be, as C. A. A. Scott and others[3] contend, that Paul chose terms from the Mysteries to illustrate the truths of Christianity, or

---

1 Angus, S., The Mystery Religions and Christianity, pp.244-245.

2 This position is taken by W. Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 142; Macchioro, From Orpheus to Paul, pp.201-204, (conscious influence); P. Gardner, The Religious Experience of St. Paul, pp. 79, 80; H.R.Willoughby, Pagan Regeneration, p. 180.

3 Scott, op. cit., p. 129; Deissmann, Paul, p. 166; F. G. Peabody, The Apostle Paul and the Modern World, p. 208; McNeile, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, p. 80; Weinel, op.cit., pp. 163-164.

of ritual; they surrounded a religion so illusion such as has rarely appeared in religious history, but with which ethical considerations were not of primary interest; they produced the physical symbol and the religious experience. But they succeeded in an aesthetically religious and moralizing age, which proves that they were able in some degree to satisfy religious longings. . . . In consulting these quite to back which their works as well as their defects, but we must also finally adjudicate upon them, as we would upon Christianity, by their fruits. 'The apostles,' says professor Tucker, (The Western Journal, p.13) 'had a better support than that upon which rest the literature from humanity and of a life beyond the tomb, and a worse respect, in that they opened the way to superstition, to hierarchism, and to magic.'[1]

Angus' thoroughgoing study demonstrates that there were both values and disvalues, good and bad moral elements in the Mysteries. This consideration is significant for our study of Paul's ethics. The direct influence of the Mysteries on Paul is seriously contested by modern scholars. Though many admit that Paul used terms common to the Mysteries, and was therefore unconsciously debtor to them,[2] few take the position that he deliberately appropriated the religious or moral doctrines and ideals of the Mysteries. It may be, as C. A. A. Scott and others[3] contend, that Paul chose terms from the Mysteries to illustrate the truths of Christianity, or

---

1 Angus, S., The Mystery Religions and Christianity, pp.244-246.

2 This position is taken by . Morgan, The Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 142; Deissmann, From Adolphus to Paul, pp.101-202; (Conscious Influence); F. Burkitt, The Religious Environment of St. Paul, pp. 79, 80; H. A. Kellogg, Pagan Preparation, p. 190

3 Scott, op. cit., p. 122; Deissmann, Paul, p. 166; . . A. Dewdney, The Apostle Paul and the Modern World, p. 208; Kennedy, New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's, p. 80; Weinel, op. cit., pp. 102-104.

filled such terms with Christian meaning. But that is quite different from saying that Paul owed his ethics to the Mysteries. Even if we were to admit with Willoughby and Macchioro that Paul consciously borrowed from the Mysteries, it is hard to see how he could have regarded any moral principles they had to offer as superior or preferable to those which he inherited from Judaism, not to mention those which he gained through his Christian experience.

We conclude, therefore, that although Paul may unconsciously have been influenced by the Mystery Religions, the ethics of the Mysteries did not constitute the primary source of his ethics.

Judaism and Paul's ethics

When we swing the searchlight of inquiry from Stoicism and the Mystery Religions to Judaism, and ask to what extent the ethics of Judaism served as the source for Paul's ethics, we enter upon a very different kind of source-problem. Neither Stoicism nor the Mysteries constituted Paul's native religious sphere. Judaism did. Paul was a Jew; how highly he prized his membership in the chosen people, how jealously he guarded his Jewish heritage, has already been indicated. As a Jew he fell heir to the highest ethical tradition of his time. In that tradition he was thoroughly trained; its moral ideals were indelibly stamped upon his mind and character. He could never escape the influence of Judaism.

fills such terms with Christian meaning. But that is quite different from saying that Paul owed his ethics to the Mysteries. Even if we were to admit with Kilpatrick and Reitzenstein that Paul consciously borrowed from the Mysteries, it is hard to see how he could have regarded any moral principles they had to offer as superior or preferable to those which he inherited from Judaism, nor to question those which he gained through his Christian experience.

We conclude, therefore, that although Paul may occasionally have been influenced by the Mystery Religions, the ethics of the Mysteries did not constitute the primary source of his ethics.

Judaism and Paul's ethics

Then we arrive at the question of inquiry from Stoicism and the Mystery Religions to Judaism, and ask to what extent the ethics of Judaism served as the source for Paul's ethics, we enter upon a very different kind of source-problem. Neither Stoicism nor the Mystery Religions established Paul's native religious sphere. Judaism did. Paul was a Jew; he highly he prized his membership in this one an people, how jealously he jeopardized his Jewish heritage, has already been indicated. In a way he felt loyal to the national ethical traditions of his time. In that tradition he was thoroughly trained; his moral ideals were indelibly stamped upon his mind and character. He could never escape the influence of Judaism.

The changes in Paul's ethical outlook wrought by his Christ-mysticism involved no denial of the fundamental virtues of Judaism. Indeed, as one observer points out,

> The general religious and ethical contents of the Septuagint are for him the self-evident presupposition even of his Christian piety.[1]

The ethical ideals of Paul the Christian rested upon the tried and tested moral code of Judaism. Both as a Jew and as a Christian Paul cherished the moral standards of the Torah: the sanctities of domestic life, the duty of brotherly love, the purity of relationship between the sexes, the dignity of manual labor. Indeed,

> The morality of Judaism was such that, with the exception of trivialities of tradition and excessive biblicism, it could be transferred _en bloc_ into Christianity.[2]

As Jesus drew the great bulk of his moral teaching from Judaism, so did Paul. In the moral teaching of both the rugged values of Jewish morality are discernible. The very ethical ideals which Paul conceived as capable of realization only through Christ-mysticism are Jewish in character, even though not in form.

The definite dependence of Paul upon Judaism for his ethical ideals is therefore hardly a debatable question. Much more than in the case of Stoicism or the Mysteries, Paul may be said to have drawn upon Judaism for his ethics.

---

1 Deissmann, _Paul_, p. 99.

2 Angus, _op. cit._, p. 261.

The changes in Paul's ethical outlook brought by his Christ-mysticism involved no denial of the fundamental virtues of Judaism. Indeed, as one observer points out,

> The general religious and ethical conducts of the Christians are for him the sublimest evident presupposition even of his Christianity.[1]

The ethical ideals of Paul the Christian rested upon the tried and tested moral code of Judaism. Both as a Jew and as a Christian Paul cherished the moral standards of the Torah: the sanctities of domestic life, the duty of brotherly love, the purity of relationship between the sexes, the dignity of manual labor. Indeed,

> The morality of Judaism was such that, with the exception of trivialities of tradition and excessive ritualism, it could be transferred en bloc into Christianity.[2]

Jesus drew the great bulk of his moral teaching from Judaism, so did Paul. In the moral teaching of both the ranged values of Jewish morality are discernible. The very ethical ideals which Paul conceived as capable of realization only through Christ-mysticism are Jewish in character, even though not in form.

The definite dependence of Paul upon Judaism for his ethical ideals is therefore hardly a debatable question. Much more than in the case of Christian or the Mysteries, Paul may be said to have drawn upon Judaism for his ethics.

---

1 Deissmann, op. cit., p. 92.

2 Angus, op. cit., p. 201.

But this way of putting the matter does not tell the whole truth, nor even the most important part of the truth about Paul the Christian's relation to Jewish ethics. On the basis of what we have said thus far it might be supposed that the ethic of Paul the Christian is explained by the ethic of Paul the Jew, - that his ethic is mere Jewish ethic. Such is distinctly not the case. Though born and bred a Jew, Paul the Christian experienced moral values and taught moral principles which cannot be understood in terms of nor deduced from Jewish ethics alone. From the chronological point of view, the ethic of Judaism was of course Paul's "first source;" from the point of view of his Christian experience and teaching, it was but a secondary source. Just as Jesus transcended Jewish religion and morality, so did Paul. Just as the ethic of Jesus is more than Jewish ethics, so is Paul's. The determinative factor for Paul's ethic, as for his religious life as a whole, was his experience of God in and through Jesus.

Because the problem of Paul's dependence upon Jesus as a source for his ethics involves not only his reference to Jesus' ethical teaching, but also his mystical experience of Christ, we shall postpone the discussion of this most important source-problem until we have considered the personal religious problem of Paul.

But this way of putting the matter does not tell the whole truth, nor even the most important part of the truth about Paul the Christian's relation to Jewish ethics. On the basis of what we have said thus far it might be supposed that the ethic of Paul the Christian is explained by the ethic of Paul the Jew, - that his ethic is mere Jewish ethic. Such is distinctly not the case. Though born and bred a Jew, Paul the Christian repudiated moral values and taught moral principles which cannot be understood in terms of nor deduced from Jewish ethics alone. From the chronological point of view, the ethic of Judaism was of course Paul's "first source;" from the point of view of his Christian experience and teaching, it was but a secondary source. Just as Jesus determined Jewish religion and morality, so did Paul. Just as the ethic of Jesus is more than Jewish ethics, so is Paul's. The determinative factor for Paul's ethic, as for his religious life as a whole, was his experience of God in and through Jesus.

Because the problem of Paul's dependence upon Jesus as a source for his ethics involves not only his reference to Jesus' ethical teaching, but also his mystical experience of Christ, we shall postpone the discussion of this most important source-problem until we have considered the general religious problem of Paul.

Chapter VII

Paul's Personal Religious Problem and Its Bearing upon His Moral Experience

Paul's Personal Religious Problem

We noted in the previous chapter two conditioning factors which gave rise to the two types of ethical interest in Paul. We now return to the first of these, the personal religious problem.

As a thoroughgoing religionist the absorbing passion of Paul's life was to know God and to attain right relationship with him. This is the meaning of Paul's quest for "righteousness" or "justification."[1] For every Jew the method of prosecuting this quest was already prescribed. The Jewish law[2] was the God-given

---

1 δικαιοσύνη. This term, used so frequently by Paul, has the meaning of 'conduct and character which satisfy the ethical requirements of God,' (Rom 6:13, 16, 18, 19, 20; 8:10; 10:5; 14:17; II Cor 6:7, 14; 9:9, 10; 11:15; Eph 4:24; 5:9; 6:14; Phil 1:11; I Tim 6:11; II Tim 3:16; Tit 3:5) or, 'acceptance with God,' (Rom 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:17, 21; 9:30, 31; 10:4, 6, 10; I Cor 1:30; Gal 2:21; 3:6, 21; II Tim 4:8).
- - Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), pp. 469-473.

2 The English "law" and the Greek νόμος are inadequate renderings of the Hebrew "Torah." The Torah of Judaism was not confined to the rules found in the Pentateuch, but included prophecy and other forms of God's revelation to men. The Torah was for the Jews

> the medium through which religion became real to them; as it were, the glass through which they viewed all the dealings of God with their own race in the past, and with mankind in general . . . The Torah meant divine teaching upon all and everything that concerned religion. It was not confined to commands, positive or negative, but included everything that bore on religion at all.
> - - Herford, R.T., Pharisaism, pp. 70-71, 74-75.

Paul's Personal Religious Problem

As noted in the previous chapter two conditioning factors which gave rise to the two types of ethical interest in Paul. We now return to the first of these, the personal religious problem.

As a thoroughgoing religionist the absorbing passion of Paul's life was to know God and to attain right relationship with him. This is the meaning of Paul's quest for 'righteousness' or 'justification.'[1] For every, saw the method of proceeding this quest was already prescribed. The Jewish law was the God-given

---

1 Δικαιοσύνη. This term, used so frequently by Paul, has the meaning of 'conduct and character which satisfy the ethical requirements of God.' (Rom 6:13, 16, 18, 19, 20; 8:10; 10:6; 14:17; II Cor 6:7, 14; 9:9, 10; 11:15; Eph 4:24; 5:9; 6:14; Phil 1:11; I Tim 6:11; II Tim 3:16; Tit 3:5) or 'accordance with God.' (Rom 4:3, 5, 6, 9, 11, 13, 22; 5:17, 21; 9:30, 31; 10:4, 8, 10; I Cor 1:30; Gal 2:21; 3:6, 21; II Tim 4:8).
- - Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), pp. 468-475.

2 The English 'law' and the Greek words are inadequate renderings of the Hebrew 'Torah.' The Torah of Judaism was not confined to the rules found in the Pentateuch, but included prophecy and other forms of God's revelation to man. The Torah was for the Jews

> the medium through which religion became real to them; as it were, the glass through which they viewed all the dealings of God with their own race in the past, and with mankind in general . . . The Torah meant divine teaching upon all and everything that concerned religion. It was not confined to commands, positive or negative, but included everything that bore on religion at all.
> - - Herford, R.T., Pharisaism, pp. 70-71, 74-75.

rule of life. If a Jew kept the law he might expect to find favor with God. As the law took its origin in the revealed will of God, so its purpose was to enable man to be at one with God.

Paul's attitude toward the law is not easy to understand. The sources for the study of his attitude are letters written for specific purposes to definite groups of people. His attitude toward the law varies according to the character of the group to which he writes, or the pressure of opinion or events upon him. Yet, though paradoxical at times, Paul's general attitude is not inconsistent. In Galatians his attitude toward the law is quite different from that manifested in Romans. But as he wrote Galatians Paul was under great pressure. The treatment given in Romans is perhaps more fair. But into the problems projected by his varied use of the term law we shall not here enter. What seems essential to this thesis is a simple account of Paul's personal experience under the law, and the transformation wrought in his religious experience by his Christ-mysticism.

Paul's experience under the law

As a Hebrew of the Hebrews, born of the tribe of Benjamin,[1] and trained under Gamaliel, Paul early came under the influence of the law, and had its outlook, method, and tenets firmly implanted in his thinking. But Paul was also a Pharisee, and under Pharisaism the law which was the vital element in Judaism became a legalistic code of ceremonial and

---

1 Phil 3:5.

rule of life. If a law certain law, he might expect to find favor with God. As the law took its origin in the revealed will of God, as its purpose was to enable man to be at one with God.

Paul's attitude toward the law is not easy to understand. The sources for the study of his attitude are letters written for specific purposes to definite groups of people. His attitude toward the law varies according to the character of the group to which he writes, or the pressure of opinion or events upon him. Yet, though paradoxical at times, Paul's general attitude is not inconsistent. In explaining his attitude toward the law he quite differed from that manifested in Romans. But as he wrote Galatians Paul was under great pressure. The treatment given in Romans is perhaps more fair. At into the problem projected by his varied use of the term law we shall not here enter. That seems essential to this thesis is a simple account of Paul's personal experience under the law, and the transformation wrought in his religious experience by his Christ-mysticism.

Paul's experience under the law — As a Hebrew of the Hebrews, born of the tribe of Benjamin,[1] and trained under Gamaliel, Paul early came under the influence of the law, and had his outlook molded, and hence firmly implanted in his thinking. Yet Paul was also a Pharisee, and under Pharisaism the law which was the vital element in Judaism became a legalistic code of ceremonial and

---

1 Phil 3:5.

moral statutes which externalized religion and put man's relationship to God upon the basis of bargaining legality.

Under the law as it was being interpreted in Paul's time,

> religion was reduced to a series of minute legal prescriptions and pious observances; its character was purely mechanical; ritual, ceremony, the paying of tithes and other such obligations comprised the whole of religion. Man's relation to God rested upon a strictly legalistic, business basis. It was as though God said - conform to the requirements of the legal code, attend so many services, say so many prayers, keep so many fasts, make so many offerings, perform so many acts of devotion, and, in payment for the same, you may expect salvation; you have earned or bought your salvation.[1]

Paul the Pharisee, ardent religious enthusiast bent on finding right relationship with God, adopted the law as his rule of life and gave himself conscientiously to its observance. He recognized the law as holy and spiritual, and the commandments of the law as righteous and good.[2] But though in his keeping of the law he was "blameless,"[3] he failed to find the acceptance with God which the law promised. His efforts to fulfill the law brought him no sense of satisfaction, no realization of pardon, no confidence toward God. The law simply failed to save or justify him. Instead, it condemned him, passed sentence upon

---

1 Lowstuter, Paul, Campaigner for Christ, p. 53.

2 Rom 7:12, 14. 3 Phil 3:6.

moral attitudes which externalized religion and put man's relationship to God upon the basis of merely legal obedience.

Under the law as it was being interpreted in Paul's time,

> religion was reduced to a series of minute legal prescriptions and pious observances; its character was purely mechanical; ritual, ceremony, the paying of tithes and other such obligations comprised the whole of religion. Man's relation to God rested upon a strictly legalistic, business basis. It was as though God said - conform to the requirements of the legal code, attend so many services, say so many prayers, keep so many fasts, make so many offerings, perform so many acts of devotion, and, in payment for the same, you may expect salvation; you have earned or bought your salvation.[1]

Paul the Pharisee, ardent religious enthusiast bent on finding right relationship with God, adopted the law as his rule of life and gave himself conscientiously to its observance. He recognized the law as holy and spiritual, and the commandments of the law as righteous and good.[2] But though in his keeping of the law he was "blameless,"[3] he failed to find the acceptance with God which the law promised. His efforts to fulfill the law brought him no sense of satisfaction, no realization of pardon, no confidence toward God. The law simply failed to save or justify him. Instead, it condemned him, passed sentence upon

---

1 Lowrie, Paul, Champion for Christ, p. 32.

2 Rom 7:12, 14. 3 Phil 3:6.

him, produced in him a consciousness of sin,[1] beguiled him,[2] and slew him.[3]

> Righteousness, the harmony of the human will with the divine, was only possible by fulfilling the whole Law; to fail in a single point was to break that harmony, . . . The Law, with its multitude of precepts, only served to increase the occasions of sin, and plunge the sinner in a deeper despair. . . Righteousness under the Law was impossible.[4]

Further, the law failed to save him because although it represented the highest possible ideal for the conduct of life, it afforded no aid to him who sought to realize the ideal. It was powerless to enforce its demands. In effect, it became inert, passive, and cold. Paul's whole dissatisfaction with the law was due to his conviction of its vast impotence, its utter lack of power to help a man fulfill it.

> The Law said, 'thou shalt,' but it gave no strength to the feeble will, however much it might shine with pitiless light upon the frightened conscience. Austere messenger of the will of God, it stood over its helpless slave, pointing indeed to heaven, but stretching forth no hand to lead him there.[5]

The help of God was required to fulfill the law, but the law failed to bring that help. All that it did was to plunge man into hopelessness and despair. Romans 7 reveals Paul's inner struggle with the law; his conscience drew him toward that

---

1 Rom 7:7. 2 Rom 7:11. 3 Rom 7:11.

4 Herford, Pharisaism, pp. 195, 183. 5 Ibid, p. 200.

him, produced in him a consciousness of sin,[1] beguiled him,[2] and slew him.[3]

> Righteousness, the harmony of the human will with the divine, was only possible by fulfilling the whole law; to fail in a single point was to break that harmony. . . . The law, with its multitude of precepts, only served to increase the consciousness of sin, and plunge the sinner in a deeper despair. . . . Righteousness under the law was impossible.[4]

Further, the law failed to save him because although it represented the highest possible ideal for the conduct of life, it afforded no aid to him who sought to realize the ideal. It was powerless to enforce its decrees. In effect, it became inert, passive, and cold. Paul's whole dissatisfaction with the law was due to his conviction of its vast impotence, its utter lack of power to help a man fulfill it.

> The law said, 'thou shalt,' but it gave no strength to the feeble will, however much it might shine with pitiless light upon the frightened consciousness. Austere messenger of the will of God, it stood over its helpless slave, pointing indeed to heaven, but stretching forth no hand to lead him there.[5]

The help of God was required to fulfill the law, but the law failed to bring that help. All that it did was to plunge man into hopelessness and despair. Romans 7 reveals Paul's inner struggle with the law; his conscience drew him toward that

---

1 Rom 7:7. 2 Rom 7:11. 3 Rom 7:11.

4 Deffard, Pharisaism, pp. 105, 182. 5 Ibid, p. 200.

which was good, but a contrary principle toward that which was evil; his better self told him that the law was good, and encouraged him to keep it; his other self hindered him from keeping it.

> For the good which I would I do not:
> but the evil which I would not, that I practise.[1]

The depths to which unaiding law brings a man are sounded in Paul's cry,

> Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?[2]

The solution of the problem: the mystical presence of Christ

The verse next succeeding the cry of despair and appeal for a deliverer gives Paul's triumphant answer:

> I thank God through Jesus Christ.[3]

Through the personal presence of the risen Jesus, mystically experienced, Paul was enabled to attain that which he had unsuccessfully sought through the law, - right relationship with God. Through Jesus Paul entered into a realization of acceptance, reconciliation, and justification. Christ did for him what the law failed to do: restored him to a relationship of peace and harmony with God. To Paul it appeared that it was reserved for Christ to do what the law could not do; in this sense the law became

> our tutor to bring us unto Christ,
> that we might be justified by faith.[4]

---

1 Rom 7:19. 2 Rom 7:24. 3 Rom 7:25. 4 Gal 3:24.

which was good, but a contrary principle toward that which was evil; his brother self told him that the law was good, and encouraged him to keep it; his other self hindered him from keeping it.

> For the good which I would I do not:
> but the evil which I would not, that I practice.[1]

The depths to which unyielding law brings a man are sounded in Paul's cry,

> Wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?[2]

The solution of the problem: the mystical presence of Christ

The verse next succeeding the cry of deepest and appeal for a deliverer gives Paul's triumphant answer:

> I thank God through Jesus Christ.[3]

Through the personal presence of the risen Jesus, mystically experienced, Paul was enabled to attain that which he had unsuccessfully sought through the law, - right relationship with God. Through Jesus Paul entered into a realization of acceptance, reconciliation, and justification. Christ did for him what the law failed to do: restored him to a relationship of peace and harmony with God. To Paul it appeared that it was reserved for Christ to do what the law could not do: in this sense the law became

> our tutor to bring us unto Christ,
> that we might be justified by faith.[4]

---

1 Rom 7:19. 2 Rom 7:24. 3 Rom 7:25. 4 Gal 3:24.

In Christ Paul's sense of guilt and condemnation was done away;[1] a new sense of freedom and joyous power streamed over his spirit.[2] He was no longer a servant, but a son; no longer a captive, but a free man in Christ Jesus. Christ became his deliverer, his helper, his Savior, his power to an endless life.

How was this accomplished? The Damascus conversion was the initial experience through which Paul apprehended the presence of Christ, and felt himself lifted into new and harmonious relationship with God. We saw in our examination of the conversion that through it Paul gained a new conception of God. He realized that God was a loving Father whose favor was not won by works of the law, but by inner acceptance of his love through personal attachment to his Son, Jesus Christ.

As Paul sought on the one hand to clarify this new and wonderful experience of God through Christ, and on the other to lead his converts into the same, he developed and extended his interpretation of the experience by reference to the grace of God, man's faith, and the work of the Spirit. These terms represent Paul's way of deepening and exalting his experience of Christ, and of appealing to those whom he hoped to win to the gospel.

---

1 Rom 8:1. 2 Rom 8:2.

In Christ Paul's sense of guilt and condemnation was done away;[1] a new sense of freedom and joyous power strengthened over his spirit.[2] He was no longer a servant, but a son; no longer a captive, but a free man in Christ Jesus. Christ became his deliverer, his helper, his saviour, his power to an endless life.

How was this accomplished? The Damascus conversion was the initial experience through which Paul apprehended the presence of Christ, and felt himself lifted into new and harmonious relationship with God. We see in our examination of the conversion that through it Paul gained a new conception of God. He realized that God was a loving Father whose favor was not won by works of the law, but by humer acceptance of his love through personal attachment to his Son, Jesus Christ.

As Paul sought on the one hand to clarify this new and wonderful experience of God through Christ, and on the other to lead his converts into the same, he developed and extended his interpretation of the experience by reference to the grace of God, man's faith, and the work of the Spirit. Those terms represent Paul's way of deepening and exalting his experience of Christ, and of appealing to those whom he hoped to win to the gospel.

---

1 Rom 8:1. 2 Rom 8:2.

Grace - χάρις χάρις is one of the richest words in Paul's vocabulary, and the conceptions comprehended by it are fundamental to his religious life. The meaning of χάρις is, in essence,

> favor towards men contrary to their desert;[1]

but such a minimum definition does not by any means do justice to all that Paul meant by the term. The grace of God, or of God manifested through Jesus Christ, is the love of God taking the initiative in the saving work of God in man. Grace is the foundation of Paul's whole gospel. Through the life and ministry, and particularly through the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, God's grace is revealed. Through Christ God pours into human life all his marvellous love and favor toward men; this is the manifestation of his grace.

The appropriation of God's grace — If grace is the characteristic attitude of God toward men, then right relationship with God is secured simply by receiving that grace by faith. Faith for Paul is the human appropriation of God's grace. In the faith experience man comes into full realization of God's grace as made manifest in the redemptive work of Christ. By his faith experience, which we earlier characterized as a mystical, personal relationship with Christ, man is justified, or brought into peace and harmony with God.

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), p. 424.

Grace - χάρις, χάριν is one of the richest words in Paul's vocabulary, and the concepts one comprehended by it are fundamental to his religious life. The meaning of χάρις is, in essence,

> favor bounds man contrary to their desert;[1]

but such a minimum definition does not by any means do justice to all that Paul meant by the term. The grace of God, or of God manifested through Jesus Christ, is the love of God taking the initiative in the saving work of God in man. Grace is the foundation of Paul's whole gospel. Through the life and ministry, and particularly through the sufferings, death, and resurrection of Christ, God's grace is revealed. Through Christ God pours into human life all his marvellous love and favor toward man; this is the manifestation of his grace.

The appropriation of God's grace — If grace is the characteristic attitude of God toward man, then right relationship with God is assured simply by receiving that grace by faith. Faith for Paul is the human appropriation of God's grace. In the faith experience man comes into full realization of God's grace as made manifest in the redemptive work of Christ. By his faith experience, which we earlier characterized as a mystical, personal relationship with Christ, man is justified, or brought into peace and harmony with God.

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), p. 42.

This, in brief, is the substance of Paul's speculation upon the problem of righteousness. Both in Galatians and Romans he makes it clear that God's grace, made manifest in the redemptive life of Christ, institutes a new saving order for men which supplants the old legalism of Judaism. The charter of the new dispensation Paul clearly states in Romans 3:21-26. Righteousness (justification, right relationship with God) comes by faith. This affirmation is echoed and developed in Romans 5 and Galatians 3.

The saving work of God is therefore accomplished through God's grace, mystically apprehended by man's faith. New life is born of this experience:

> . . . that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.[1]

The bearing of Paul's new relationship to God through Christ upon his moral experience	Paul's attainment of right relationship with God through the personal mystical apprehension

of Christ Jesus had a most significant bearing upon his moral experience. The sense of condemnation which he suffered under the law was a clear indication of the impotence of ethics to save man. The law was a body of ethical demands which promised to bring him righteousness, but never fulfilled its promise

---

1 Gal 2:20.

This, in brief, is the substance of Paul's speculation upon the problem of righteousness. Both in Galatians and Romans he argues at clear that God's grace, made manifest in the redemptive life of Christ, institutes a new saving order for men which supplants the old legalism of Judaism. The character of the new dispensation Paul clearly states in Romans 3:21-26. Righteousness (justification, right relationship with God) comes by faith. This affirmation is echoed and developed in Romans 8 and Galatians 5.

The saving work of God is therefore accomplished through God's grace, mystically apprehended by man's faith. New life is born of this experience:

> . . . that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the faith which is in the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself up for me.[1]

The bearing of Paul's new relationship to God through Christ upon his moral experience

Paul's attainment of right relationship with God through the personal mystical apprehension

of Christ Jesus had a most significant bearing upon his moral experience. The sense of condemnation which he suffered under the law was a clear indication of the impotence of ethics to save man. The law was a body of ethical demands which promised to bring his righteousness, but never fulfilled its promise

---

1 Gal 2:20.

because it failed to supply the moral power requisite to meeting those demands. But through the presence of Christ the ethical impotence of the law was transcended. Christ brought Paul into peace and harmony with God, and that new relationship wrought in him a moral re-creation.

Ingress of moral power

Thus the first great effect wrought by Paul's new experience of God through Christ was an ingress of moral power. The love of God streamed over Paul as the power of moral action. It transformed him from a defeated ethicist into a morally victorious religionist. Thenceforth he was able to meet the demands, perform the duties, and discharge the responsibilities laid upon him, for his life was flooded with moral power. The risen Christ, mystically perceived, made moral demands upon him, but gave himself as the power toward fulfilling those demands. The man ἐν Χριστῷ could do what the man under the law could not do. Because Paul had the Spirit of Christ, he could keep

> the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.[1]

So Paul came into possession of abounding moral energy. His mysticism became morally dynamic; through fellowship with Christ he experienced an ever swelling increment of moral power. The exultant testimony to the work of the Spirit in Romans 8 and Galatians 5:22-25 is a direct reflection of his morally creative

---

1 Rom 8:2.

because it failed to supply the moral power requisite to meeting those demands. But through the presence of Christ the ethical impotence of the law was transcended. Christ brought Paul into peace and harmony with God, and that now relationship wrought in him a moral re-creation.

Increase of moral power

Thus the first great effect wrought by Paul's new experience of God through Christ was an increase of moral power. The love of God aroused over Paul as the power of moral action. It transformed him from a defeated scholiast into a morally victorious religionist. Therefore he was able to meet the demands, perform the duties, and discharge the responsibilities laid upon him, for his life was flooded with moral power. The risen Christ, mystically perceived, made moral demands upon him, but gave himself as the power toward fulfilling those demands. The man [illegible] could do what the man under the law could not do. Because Paul had the Spirit of Christ, he could keep

> the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus.[1]

So Paul came into possession of abounding moral energy. His mysticism became morally dynamic, through fellowship with Christ he experienced an ever swelling increment of moral power. The evident testimony to the work of the Spirit in Romans 8 and Galatians 5:22-23 is a direct reflection of his morally creative

---

1 Rom 8:2.

experience in Christ Jesus.

This ingress of moral power meant far more to Paul than mere freedom from the law; it meant energy for work. How did Paul accomplish all that he did? Whence came the spiritual energy that sustained his labors? How could this handicapped man perform the startling feats of physical, moral, and spiritual endurance that marked his ministry? Paul had an explanation:

> By the grace of God I am what I am: and his grace which was bestowed upon me was not found vain; but I labored more abundantly than they all: yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me. [1]

"Yet not I, but the grace of God": here is the source of Paul's power. He attributed not to himself but to God the power of moral action. This is clearly stated in II Cor 3:5,

> not that we are sufficient ourselves, to account anything as from ourselves; but our sufficiency is from God.

We gain some insight into the way this new moral power worked in Paul's experience from the account of his prayer for the removal of his thorn in the flesh and its answer. After having besought the Lord thrice that it depart from him, the reply of the Lord came,

> My grace is sufficient for thee: for my power is made perfect in weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather glory in my weaknesses, that the power of God may rest upon me. Wherefore I take pleasure in weaknesses, in injuries,

---

1 I Cor 15:10.

> in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.[1]

We see here that the ingress of power brought about by Paul's mystical experience did not function miraculously or capriciously; e.g., though Paul tried to be rid of his infirmity, it remained with him. But over against that weakness Paul developed through his constant experience of Christ a compensating moral strength, and came to regard weakness as the qualification for its realization. The long list of hard and bitter experiences found in II Cor 6: 5-10 are referred to by Paul as precisely the right conditions for the realization of God's power. In I Cor 2:1, 3 he recalls to his readers that he came to them

> not with excellency of speech or of wisdom . . . (but) in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.

He came in weakness, and did his preaching not in persuasive words of wisdom; nevertheless his work was

> in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.[2]

No trial or discouragement could dry up the springs of his moral and spiritual energy:

> I can do all things in him that strengtheneth me.[3]

The center of this radiant energy was Paul's mystical fellowship with Jesus Christ. His physical endurance under

---

1 II Cor 12:7-10. 2 I Cor 2:4. 3 Phil 4:13.

> in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ's sake: for when I am weak, then am I strong.[1]

We see here that the degree of power wrought about by Paul's mystical experiences did not function miraculously or compulsively; e.g., though Paul tried to be rid of his infirmity, it remained with him. But over against that weakness Paul developed through his constant experience of Christ a compensating moral strength, and came to regard weakness as the qualification for the realization. The long list of hard and bitter experiences found in II Cor 6: 4-10 are referred to by Paul as precisely the right conditions for the realization of God's power. In I Cor 2:1, 3 he recalls to his readers that he came to them

> not with excellency of speech or of wisdom . . . (but) in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling.

He came in weakness, and did his preaching not in persuasive words of wisdom; nevertheless his work was

> in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.[2]

No trial or discouragement could dry up the springs of his moral and spiritual energy:

> I can do all things in him that strengthenetth me.[3]

The source of this radiant energy was Paul's mystical fellowship with Jesus Christ. His physical endurance under

---

1 II Cor 12:7-10. 2 I Cor 2:4. 3 Phil 4:13.

hardship, his moral conquest of self, his spiritual enterprise and initiative he ascribed to the working of a power not his own within him. In one of his finest passages Matthew Arnold characterizes this ingress of power through faith:

> If ever there was a case in which the wonder-working power of attachment, in a man for whom the moral sympathies and the desire for righteousness were all-powerful, might employ itself and work its wonders, it was here. Paul felt this power penetrate him: and he felt also, how by perfectly identifying himself through it with Jesus, by appropriating Jesus, and in no other way, could he ever get the confidence and the force to do as Jesus did. He thus found a point in which the mighty world outside man, and the weak world inside him, seemed to combine for his salvation. The struggling stream of duty, which had not volume enough to bear him to his goal, was suddenly reinforced by the immense tidal wave of sympathy and emotion.
>
> To this new and potent influence Paul gave the name faith. More fully he calls it: 'Faith that worketh through love.' (Gal.5:6) The essential meaning of the word faith is 'power of holding on to the unseen,' 'fidelity,' . . . a power, pre-eminently, of holding fast to an unseen power of goodness. Identifying ourselves with Jesus Christ through this attachment we become as he was. We appropriate him, we live with his thoughts and feelings, and we participate, therefore, in his freedom from the ruinous law in our members, in his obedience to the saving law of the Spirit, in his conformity to the eternal order, in the joy and peace of his life to God . . . This is what is done for us by faith.[1]

---

1 M. Arnold, St. Paul and Protestantism, pp. 47-48.

hardship, his moral courage of self, his spiritual enterprise and initiative he ascribed to the working of a power not his own within him. In one of his finest passages Matthew Arnold enterprises this impress of power through faith:

> If ever there was a case in which the wonder-working power of attendency, in a man for whom the moral sympathies and the desire for righteousness were all-powerful, might simply itself and work its wonders, it was here. Paul felt this power penetrate him: and he felt also, how by perfectly identifying himself through it with Jesus, by appropriating Jesus, and in no other way, could he ever get the confidence and the force to do as Jesus did. So this found a point in which the mighty world outside man, and the weak world inside him, seemed to combine for his salvation. The struggling stream of duty, which had not volume enough to bear him to his goal, was suddenly reinforced by the immense tidal wave of sympathy and emotion.
>
> To this new and potent influence Paul gave the name faith. More fully he calls it: 'Faith that worketh through love.' (Gal.5:6) The essential meaning of the word faith is 'power of holding on to the unseen,' 'trustfulness,' . . . a power, pre-eminently, of holding fast to an unseen power of goodness. Identifying ourselves with Jesus Christ through this attachment we become as he was. We appropriate him, we live with his strengths and feelings, and we participate. Therefore, in his freedom from the rudimous law in our members, in his obedience to the saving law of the Spirit, in his conformity to the eternal order, in the joy and peace of his life to God . . . This is what is done for us by faith.[1]

---

1 M. Arnold, St. Paul and Protestantism, p. 47-48.

The moral paradox of Paul

One of the most perplexing antinomies in Paul's experience is the paradox presented by his conception of the supernatural working of Christ (God, or the Spirit) in him, on the one hand, and his assumption of the necessity for human moral effort on the other.

It is plain that Paul conceived moral power in individual experience to be supernaturally inspired.

> It is no longer I that live, but Christ liveth in me.[1]

This witness to the work of Another in him, and in other believers, is amplified by allusions to the working of Christ and of the Spirit in Christians, most of which we have already noted in our discussion of the expression of the mystical element in Paul.[2] There is in him a profound sense of surging power which comes from beyond, and which he identifies as the power of God,[3] of Christ,[4] or of the Spirit.[5] Without this power Paul could not live. It is a life-giving, ethically transforming energy which seizes man, and virtually makes of him a new creation.[6] In contrast to the moral power sought through obedience to the law, a power depending upon the treasuring up of merit, this power is given, and is dependent only upon man's readiness to receive it. Once accepted, it dominates all of life.

---

1 Gal 2:20.

2 Cf. especially Rom 5:5; Phil 1:6, 3:13, 4:19; Col 1:11, 29, 3:16; I Cor 6:11; II Cor 4:12, and pp.119-120supra.

3 Eph 1:19. 4 Phil 1:21. 5 Rom 8. 6 II Cor 5:17.

The moral paradox of Paul

One of the most persistent & scandalous

In Paul's experience is the paradox presented by his conception of the supernatural working of Christ (God, or the Spirit) in him, on the one hand, and his assumption of the necessity for human moral effort on the other.

It is plain that Paul conceived moral power in individual experience to be supernaturally inspired.

> It is no longer I that live, but Christ lives in me.[1]

This witness to the work of Christ in him, and in other believers, is amplified by allusions to the working of Christ and of the Spirit in Christians, much of which we have already noted in our discussion of the expression of the mystical element in Paul.[2] There is in him a profound sense of surging power which comes from beyond, and which he identifies as the power of God,[3] of Christ,[4] or of the Spirit.[5] Without this power Paul could not live. It is a life-giving, ethically transforming energy which seizes man, and virtually makes of him a new creation.[6] In contrast to the moral power sought through obedience to the law, a power depending upon the human rising up of merit, this power is given, and is dependent only upon man's readiness to receive it. Once accepted, it dominates all of life.

---

1 Gal 2:20.

2 Cf. especially Rom 8:9; Phil 1:6, 3:15, 4:13; Col 1:11, 29, 3:16; I Cor 6:11; II Cor 4:12, and pp.110-120supra.

3 Eph 1:19. 4 Phil 1:21. 5 Rom 8. 6 II Cor 5:17.

Now the paradox in Paul's experience is created by the assumption throughout his letters that the Christian must exercise some moral effort of his own. At one moment Paul speaks as though transference into the realm of the Spirit guarantees the moral perfection of believers automatically. At another he issues moral injunctions which demand the exercise of moral effort in believers. His frequent commands to "walk in the Spirit," reveal his dependence upon the normal moral effort characteristic of ordinary ethical experience. He enjoins the Philippians:

> Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.[1]

Are we to assume that Paul conceived his mystical relationship to Christ as involving a kind of divine determinism, in which, once the relationship is established, no further moral effort is necessary, and from which the perfect moral life will blossom as flower from the seed? Surely such a conception runs counter to the common moral experience of mankind. For the sine qua non of normal moral life is autonomy of the will. Did Paul boldly set aside this normal function of human will? Did he belittle the integrity of man's moral nature, and declare man incapable of moral attainment? Was the righteousness imputed by faith automatic righteousness? Did his declaration that "in my flesh dwelleth no good thing" mean an utter distrust of the natural moral constitution of man?

---

1 Phil 2:12.

Now the paradox in Paul's experience is grounded by the assumption throughout his letters that the Christian must exercise some moral effort of his own. At one moment Paul speaks as though transformation into the realm of the Spirit guarantees the moral perfection of believers automatically. At another he issues moral injunctions which demand the exercise of moral effort in believers. His frequent commands to "walk in the Spirit," reveal his dependence upon the normal moral effort characteristic of ordinary ethical experience. He enjoins the Philippians:

> Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling.[1]

Are we to assume that Paul conceived the mystical relationship to Christ as involving a kind of divine determinism, in which, once the relationship is established, no further moral effort is necessary, and from which the perfect moral life will issue as flower from the seed? Surely such a conception runs counter to the common moral experience of mankind. For the sine qua non of normal moral life is autonomy of the will. Did Paul boldly cut aside this normal function of human will? Did he belittle the integrity of man's moral nature, and declare man incapable of moral attainment? Was the righteousness imputed by faith wholly his righteousness? Did his declaration that "in my flesh dwelleth no good thing" mean an utter distrust of the normal moral constitution of man?

---

1. Phil 2:12.

There is no final answer to this problem. The only "solution" we can arrive at is an unresolved paradox. Strong as are Paul's utterances concerning the working of a supernatural power in him, there is abundant evidence to show that he did depend upon some moral effort for the attainment of the Christian standard of conduct. The tremendous emphasis given to the supernatural element in his ethical experience and teaching is due to his passionate endeavor to free himself and others from the binding restrictions of the law. To clear this barrier he was compelled to transcend it, and in so doing, he appealed primarily not to the moral nature of man, but to the character of God. In making the leap from the human to the divine Paul performed an act of faith which carried him far into supernaturalism. In theory the man in Christ lives in a different world, a spiritual world, and his moral conduct will perforce conform to that world. This was the original and distinctive contribution of Paul. But in practice, both in his own personal life and that of believers, moral effort was expected, and it was exercised. The long discussion of moral problems in I and II Corinthians, the exhortations and admonitions in every one of his letters, make it clear that Paul never relinquished the autonomy of his own will, nor assumed that other believers would forfeit theirs. However perplexing the paradox of grace and free will may appear as a problem for thought, it is a matter of common Christian experience that both divine influence and human moral effort are possible,

There is no final answer to this problem. The only "solution" we can arrive at is an unresolved paradox. Strong as are Paul's utterances concerning the working of a supernatural power in him, there is abundant evidence to show that he did depend upon some moral efforts for the attainment of the Christian standard of conduct. The tremendous emphasis given to the supernatural element in his ethical experience and teaching is due to his passionate endeavor to free himself and others from the binding restrictions of the law. To clear this barrier he was compelled to transcend it, and in so doing, he appealed primarily not to the moral nature of man, but to the character of God. In making the leap from the human to the divine Paul performed an act of faith which carried him far into supernaturalism. In theory the man in Christ lives in a different world, a spiritual world, and his moral conduct will perforce conform to that world. This was the original and distinctive contribution of Paul. But in practice, both in his own personal life and that of believers, moral effort was expected, and it was exercised. The long discussion of moral problems in I and II Corinthians, the exhortations and admonitions in every one of his letters, make it clear that Paul never relinquished the autonomy of his own will, nor assumed that other believers would forfeit theirs. However perplexing the paradox of grace and free will may appear as a problem for thought, it is a matter of common Christian experience that both divine influence and human moral effort are possible.

even necessary, in the prosecution of the Christian life.[1]

Thus Paul, the man in Christ, never wholly supplants moral autonomy with divine grace. The word of Christ comes to him with power:

My grace is sufficient for thee,[2]

---

1 'That which was begun by Grace, gets accomplished by both Grace and Free Will, so that they operate mixedly not separately, simultaneously not successively, in each and all of their processes. The acts are not in part Grace, in part Free Will; but the whole of each act is effected by both in an undivided operation.' Bernard, Tractatus de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, cap. xiv. par. 47; (quoted by Von Hügel, The Mystical Element of Religion, I, pp. 69-70.)

Von Hügel adds: Simply all and every one of our acts, our very physical existence and persistence, is dependent, at every moment and in every direction, upon the prevenient, accompanying, and subsequent power of God; and still more is every religious, every truly spiritual and supernatural act of the soul impossible without the constant action of God's grace. Yet not only does all this not prevent the soul from consciously acting on her own part, and according to the laws of her own being; but God's grace acts in and through the medium of her acts, inasmuch as these are good: so that the very same action which, seen as it were from without as the effect of our own volition, is,seen as it were from within, the effect of God's grace. The more costly is our act of love or of sacrifice, the more ethical and spiritual, and the more truly it is our own deepest self-expression, so much the more, at the same time, is this action a thing received as well as given, and that we have it to give, and that we can and do give it, is itself a pure gift of God . . . Grace and Will thus rise and fall, in their degree of action, together; and man will never be so fully active, so truly and intensively himself, as when he is most possessed by God.
Von Hügel, op. cit., I, pp. 79-80.

2 II Cor 12:9.

even necessary, in the profession of the Christian life.[1]

Thus then, the man in Christ, never wholly supplants moral autonomy with divine grace. The word of Christ comes to him with power:

My grace is sufficient for thee.[2]

---

1 'Just which was begun by Grace, gets accomplished by both Grace and free Will, so that they operate already not separately, simultaneously not successively, in each and all of their processes. The acts are not in part Grace, in part free Will; but the whole of each act is effected by both in an undivided operation.' Bernard, Tractatus de Gratia et Libero Arbitrio, cap. xiv, par. 47; (quoted by Von Hügel, The Mystical Element of Religion, I, pp. 29-30.)

Von Hügel adds: 'Simply all and every one of our acts, our very physical existence and personalness, is dependent, at every moment and in every direction, upon the preventing, accompanying, and subsequent power of God; and still more is every real form, every truly spiritual and supernatural act of the soul impossible without the constant action of God's grace. Yet not only does all this not prevent the soul from consciously acting on her own part, and according to the laws of her own being; but God's grace acts in and through the medium of her acts, transmuted as those are good: so that the very cause action which, seen as it were from without as the effect of our own volition, is, seen as it were from within, the effect of God's grace. The more socially is our act of love or of sacrifice, the more ethical and spiritual, and the more truly it is our own highest self-expression, so much the more, at the same time, is this action a thing received as well as given, and that we have it to give, and that we can and do give it, is itself a pure gift of God . . . Grace and free will thus rise and fall, in their degrees of action, together; and man will never be so truly active, so truly and intensively himself, as when he is most possessed by God.

Von Hügel, op. cit., I, pp. 72-80.

2 II Cor 12:9.

but he must still

> press on toward the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.[1]

He must still buffet his body, and bring it into subjection.

> Der Vollbesitz sittlicher Kraft

is counterbalanced by

> Das Ringen nach Vollendung.[2]

So with all believers; they are the "temple of God," and the Spirit of God dwells in them. They are the "body of Christ." They are surcharged with new moral power, have become indeed a "creation" of a new order. But they are still far from perfect; they are given to scandalous living, to factions, to gossip, to vengeance, to self-indulgence, to sexual irregularities. All these must be "put off" and Christ "put on." Whatever disposition Paul makes of the autonomy of the will in theory, he leans on it heavily in practice.

Thus Paul's mystico-ethical experience does not invalidate the normal functioning of the human will. He does not in practice assume that being in Christ will produce ethical fruit independent of moral effort, though his language at times suggests that he does. We interpret Paul's mysticism in moral terms, dynamically, not statically. There is room in his experience for the interplay of both human and divine influence. The emotional

---

1 Phil 3:14.

2 W. Weber, Christus Mystik, pp. 84, 86.

but he must still

press on toward the high calling of God in
Christ Jesus.[1]

He must still belief his body, and bring it into subjection.

Her Vollbewusste sittlicher Ernst

is counterbalanced by

Das Eigen nach Vollendung.[2]

So with all believers; they are the "temple of God," and the Spirit of God dwells in them. They are the "body of Christ." They are surcharged with new moral power, have become indeed a "creation" of a new order. But they are still far from perfect; they are given to sensuous living, to sullens, to gossip, to vengeance, to self-indulgence, to sexual irregularities. All these must be "put off" and Christ "put on." Whatever disposition Paul takes of the authority of the will in theory, he leans on it heavily in practice.

Thus Paul's mystico-ethical experience does not invalidate the normal functioning of the human will. He does not in practice assume that being in Christ will produce ethical fruit independent of moral effort, though his language at times suggests that he does. He interprets Paul's mysticism in moral terms, dynamically, not statically. There is room in his apperceptions for the interplay of both human and divine influence. The emotional

---

1 Phil 3:14.

2 F. Weber, Christliche Ethik, pp. 84, 86.

intensity springing from a close intimacy with and conscious awareness of the risen Christ stimulated and heightened his moral effort. His supernaturalism does not make void the inherent moral capabilities of human nature, but enormously increases them.

Chapter VIII

The Relation of Paul's Mysticism to His Ethical Teaching

In the previous chapter we dealt with the bearing of Paul's new relationship to God through Christ upon his own personal moral experience. In this chapter we face the problem, How did his mystical experience of God through Christ affect his ethical teaching among his converts?

Jesus as the source of Paul's ethics

This problem may be considered from a number of different angles. In the first place, did Jesus become the source for Paul's ethics? We saw in Chapter VI that Paul did not consciously draw his ethical ideals from Stoicism or the Mystery Religions, and that his Jewish ethical heritage does not explain his Christian ethical teaching. Did Paul, then, get his ethics from Jesus?

Our answer is that he did, but in a peculiar way. Paul's recorded ethical teaching, though based upon the historical ethical teaching of Jesus, depended primarily upon his mystical experience of the presence of Christ.

If we inquire to what extent Paul's letters repeat, quote, or otherwise literally transmit the specific ethics of Jesus, the question boils down to one of literary evidence, and the nature of the evidence compels us to answer conditionally. 1) There are few instances where Paul can be said literally to quote Jesus, or to transmit his ethical teaching in exact form. In Acts 20:35 the

narrator puts into the mouth of Paul one quotation from the words of Jesus:

> It is more blessed to give than to receive.

This quotation is a part of Paul's speech at Miletus, certainly authentic. But the phrase itself is not found in the gospels. Elsewhere Paul quotes the Old Testament precept,

> Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself,

as the fulfillment of the law, just as Jesus did.[1] But he does not attach to his statement the sanction of Jesus.

2) There are a few instances in which Paul seems consciously to refer to the <u>authority</u> of Jesus for some ethical precept. For example, in I Cor. 9:14 (cf. I Tim 5:18) he says,

> Even so did the Lord ordain that they that proclaim the gospel should live of the gospel,

evidently referring to Jesus' teaching that the laborer is worthy of his hire.[2] In I Cor 7:10-11 he cites the authority of Jesus for his injunction,

> That the wife depart not from her husband, . . . and that the husband leave not his wife,

as though this teaching of Jesus were current among them. Again, Paul feels himself

---

1 Gal 5:14; Rom 13:8; cf. Mt. 19:19 and Lev. 19:18.

2 Mt. 10:9-10; Lk 10:7.

> persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is unclean of itself: save that to him who accounteth anything to be unclean, to him it is unclean,[1]

which might be taken as a reference to Jesus' teaching on defilement.[2] It will be seen that even these examples fail to show any literal transmission of the known teachings of Jesus.

3) At many points Paul's ethical teaching parallels that of Jesus, but does not seem consciously to borrow from it. Thus the thought of Rom 13:6-7, where Paul says,

> For this cause ye pay tribute also. . . Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due. .

parallels Mt 22:21. His counsel to the Corinthians,

> Why not rather take wrong?
> Why not rather be defrauded? (I Cor 6:7)

> Render no man evil for evil, (Rom 12:7)

> Be not overcome of evil, but overcome evil with good, (Rom 12:21)

parallels Jesus' teaching in Mt 5:39. Likewise,

> Bless them that curse you; bless, and curse not, (Rom 12:14)

> If thine enemy hunger, feed him; if he thirst, give him to drink: (Rom 12:20)

parallels Mt 5:44, Lk 6:27-28. Paul's advice to the disciples to be

> wise unto that which is good, and simple unto that which is evil (Rom 16:19)

parallels Jesus'

---

1 Rom 14:14. 2 Mk 7:15.

persuaded in the Lord Jesus, that nothing is
unclean of itself: save that to him who
accounteth anything to be unclean, to him
it is unclean.[1]

which might be taken as a reference to Jesus teaching on defile-
ment.[2] It will be seen that even these examples fail to show
any literal translation of the known teachings of Jesus.

3) As many points Paul's ethical teaching parallels
that of Jesus, but does not seem consciously to borrow from it.
Thus the thought of Rom 13:6-7, where Paul says,

For this cause ye pay tribute also. . .
render to all their dues: tribute to
whom tribute is due. .

parallels Mt 22:21. His counsel to the Corinthians,

Why not rather take wrong?
Why not rather be defrauded? (I Cor 6:7)

Render no man evil for evil. (Rom 12:17)

Be not overcome of evil, but overcome
evil with good. (Rom 12:21)

parallels Jesus' teaching in Mt 5:39. Likewise,

Bless them that curse you: bless, and
curse not. (Rom 12:14)

If thine enemy hunger, feed him;
if he thirst, give him to drink: (Rom 12:20)

parallels Mt 5:44, Lk 6:27-28. Paul's advice to the Thessalo-
nians is

Also unto that which is good, and simple
unto that which is evil (Rom 16:19)

parallels Jesus'

---

1 Rom 14:14. 2 Mk 7:1.

> be wise as serpents, but harmless as doves. (Mt 10:16)

Paul's admonition,

> Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law of Christ, (Gal 6:2)

to which Phil 2:4, I Cor 10:24,33; 11:1 are comparable in thought, suggests Jesus' teaching regarding self-sacrifice and regard for the welfare of others.

Returning now to our original question as to whether Paul's writings give literary evidence of precise transmission of Jesus' ethical material, it is apparent that Paul's appeal to the authority of Jesus, and his parallelisms with Jesus are <u>not</u> such as to demonstrate direct transmission.

But having reached that conclusion, we dare not assume that Paul's ethic was independent of the ethic of Jesus. Indeed, the very appeal to the authority of Jesus, and the parallels between the ethics of Jesus and the ethics of Paul suggest that in his missionary preaching and teaching Paul drew largely upon the ethical teaching of Jesus. As he told the story of Jesus to those who had never heard it before, how could he avoid reference to Jesus' sayings and parables, so many of which were ethical in character? That Paul was thoroughly familiar with the sayings and parables of Jesus cannot be doubted. The ethical teaching of Jesus was a constituent part of Paul's gospel. There is every reason to suppose, therefore, that Paul gave it full place in his preaching of the gospel.

be wise as serpents, but harmless as doves. (Mt 10:16)

Paul's admonition,

> Bear ye one another's burdens, and so
> fulfill the law of Christ. (Gal 6:2)

to which Phil 2:4, 2 Cor 10:24,33; 11:1 are comparable in thought, suggests Jesus' teaching regarding self-sacrifice and concern for the welfare of others.

Returning now to our original question as to whether Paul's writings give literary evidence of precise transmission of Jesus' ethical material, it is apparent that Paul's appeal to the authority of Jesus, and his parallelisms with Jesus are not such as to demonstrate direct transmission.

But having reached that conclusion, we dare not assume that Paul's ethic was independent of the ethic of Jesus. Indeed, the very appeal to the authority of Jesus, and the parallels between the ethics of Jesus and the ethics of Paul suggest that in his missionary preaching and teaching Paul drew largely upon the ethical teaching of Jesus. As he told the story of Jesus to those who had never heard it before, how could he avoid reference to Jesus' sayings and parables, so many of which were ethical in character? That Paul was thoroughly familiar with the sayings and parables of Jesus cannot be doubted. The ethical teaching of Jesus was a consistent part of Paul's gospel. There is every reason to suppose, therefore, that Paul gave it full place in his preaching of the gospel.

But Paul's relationship to Jesus was not that of a disciple who, having heard or read the ethical teaching of Jesus, passed it on to others as the wisdom of a departed sage.[1] His relationship was one of immediate awareness of the presence of Jesus; and the ethic he taught among his converts was the deliverance of his mystical experience of Christ. Christ lived in Paul as a present power; the ethical teaching of Paul was vitalized and dominated by his mystical fellowship with Christ. From this angle the mystical presence of Christ was the source of Paul's ethics, for Christ not only gave him moral power, but made ethical demands upon him. Those demands Paul regarded as binding upon him, authoritative for the conduct of life. The ethical impact of Jesus upon Paul and upon all other believers was delivered through the medium of their present mystical awareness of Christ. This accounts for the infrequent quotations from Jesus' ethical teaching in Paul's letters. In fellowship with Christ Paul received personally and immediately whatever moral direction from Christ he required.

Such a view of Paul's relation to Jesus by no means rules out any historic dependence of Paul on Jesus. As we saw in Chapter II, the "mystic way of knowing" involves all other

---

1 J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, S. 431, says,

> Das Verhältnis des Paulus zu seinem erhöhten Herrn ist eben ein rein religiöses, und die Mitglieder seiner Gemeinden sind in der ganz überwiegenden Mehrzahl niemals in einem Schüler-Vehältnis zu Jesus gewesen.

But Paul's relationship to Jesus was not that of a disciple who, having heard or read the ethical teaching of Jesus, passed it on to others as the wisdom of a departed sage.[1] His relationship was one of immediate awareness of the presence of Jesus; and the ethic he taught among his converts was the deliverance of his mystical experience of Christ. Christ lived in Paul as a present power; the ethical teaching of Paul was vitalized and dominated by his mystical fellowship with Christ. From this angle the mystical presence of Christ was the source of Paul's ethics, for Christ not only gave him moral power, but made ethical demands upon him. These demands Paul regarded as binding upon him, authoritative for the conduct of life. The ethical impact of Jesus upon Paul and upon all other believers was delivered through the medium of their present mystical awareness of Christ. This accounts for the infrequent quotations from Jesus' ethical teaching in Paul's letters. In fellowship with Christ Paul received personally and immediately whatever moral direction from Christ he required.

Such a view of Paul's relation to Jesus by no means rules out any historic dependence of Paul on Jesus. As we saw in Chapter II, the "mystic way of knowing" involves all other

---

1 J. Weiss, Das Urchristentum, S. 631, says:
"Das Verhältnis des Paulus zu seinem erhöhten Herrn ist eben ein rein religiöses, und die sittlichen e-ister Gemeinden sind in der ganz theoretischen andern Weise mit einem Sohlen-Verhältnis zu Jesus gewesen.

ways of knowing, including reason and cognition. That Paul had in the background of his mind a clear knowledge and appreciation of the moral character and ethical teaching of Jesus is evident. All that he knew concerning the ethical teaching of Jesus was involved in his mystical experience of him. But in practice, Paul grounded his own ethical teaching in an appeal to the personal presence of Christ.

Thus the mind of Christ superseded in Paul's ethic the words of Jesus. Through mystic fellowship with Christ Paul adopted the attitudes toward God, man, and the world that Jesus manifested. His outlook, his philosophy, his faith, his ethic, tended to coincide with Christ's. Because he knew Christ so intimately Paul felt that he could speak for him and interpret his mind to others. In I Cor 2:16,

> We have the mind of Christ,
>
> means not merely, 'we think as Christ thinks,' but 'Christ thinks in us:' the mental processes of the Christian are under the immediate inspiration of the Spirit of Christ; He it is who enables his followers to develop, to apply, and to interpret the will of God.[1]

Thus when Paul says that his ways are in Christ,[2] or that he knows, and is persuaded of the Lord Jesus,[3] he is voicing his conviction that the moral teaching he prescribes is what Jesus himself would follow and teach.[4]

---

1 J. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 115.

2 I Cor 4:17. 3 Rom 14:14. 4 J. Weiss, op.cit., p. 116.

ways of knowing, including reason and cognition. Paul had in the background of his mind a clear knowledge and appreciation of the moral character and ethical teaching of Jesus is evident. All that he knew concerning the ethical teaching of Jesus was involved in his spiritual experience of him. But in practice, Paul grounds his own ethical teaching in an appeal to the personal presence of Christ.

Thus the mind of Christ regenerated in Paul's ethic the words of Jesus. Through upright fellowship with Christ, Paul adopted the attitudes toward God, men, and the world that Jesus manifested. His outlook, his philosophy, his faith, his ethic, tended to coincide with Christ's. Because he knew Christ so intimately Paul felt that he could speak for him and interpret his mind to others. In I Cor 2:16,

> We have the mind of Christ,
>
> means not merely, 'we think as Christ thinks,' but 'Christ thinks in us:' the typical processes of the Christian are under the immediate inspiration of the Spirit of Christ; he it is who enables his followers to develop, to apply, and to interpret the will of God.[1]

Thus when Paul says that his ways are in Christ,[2] or that he knows, and is persuaded of the Lord Jesus,[3] he is voicing his conviction that the moral teaching he prescribed in what Jesus himself would follow and teach.[4]

---

1 G. Weiss, Paul and Jesus, p. 116.

2 I Cor 4:17. 3 Rom 14:14. 4 G. Weiss, op.cit., p. 116.

Here, as elsewhere, we interpret Paul's claim to possess the "mind of Christ" as an indication of his thorough understanding of the character of Jesus. As Wernle says,

> Paul never knew Jesus in his life-time; but nevertheless it was he who best understood him.[1]

Proof of this understanding is offered by a demonstration of the inner harmony which exists between the ethical teaching of Paul and Jesus. 1) Both give prominence to the doctrine of the divine will; the words of the Lord's prayer, and the experience of Jesus in Gethsemane, reveal the same attitude toward God's will which Paul expresses in Col 4:12, I Thes 4:3, and Rom 12:2. 2) Their teaching of the inwardness of religion harmonizes remarkably: Rom 2:28-29 echoes Jesus' teaching in the Sermon of the Mount. 3) Though taking different attitudes toward the Jewish law, Jesus and Paul are at one in their transcendence of it. Jesus says, Ye have heard it said . . but I say unto you, thus amending the law by an authority based on his own insight, while Paul sees the powerlessness of the whole law, and without trying to amend it, sets it aside as having only a temporary value.

> In the case of both great teachers, however, we see the ethnic morality of the Jews giving way to an ethic which is spiritual and in the highest sense human.[2]

4) In the exaltation of the Christian virtues of gentleness, meekness, joy, peace, Paul approximates the ethical thought of

---

1 Quoted by Gardner, op.cit., p. 145. 2 Gardner, ibid., p.149.

Here, as elsewhere, we interpret Paul's claim to possess the 'mind of Christ' as an indication of his thorough understanding of the character of Jesus. As Orrick says,

> Paul never knew Jesus in his life-time; but nevertheless it was he who best understood him.[1]

Proof of this understanding is offered by a demonstration of the inner harmony which exists between the ethical teaching of Paul and Jesus. 1) Both give prominence to the doctrine of the divine will; the words of the Lord's prayer, and the experience of Jesus in Gethsemane reveal the same attitude toward God's will which Paul expresses in cf. 1:12, 1 Thes 4:3, and Rom 12:2. 2) Their teaching of the lawfulness of religion harmonizes remarkably: Rom 2:25-29 echoes Jesus' teaching in the Sermon of the Mount. 3) Though taking different attitudes toward the Jewish law, Jesus and Paul are at one in their transcendence of it. Jesus says, 'Ye have heard it said . . but I say unto you', thus amending the law by an authority based on his own insight. While Paul sees the powerlessness of the whole law, and without trying to amend it, sets it aside as having only a temporary value.

> In the case of both great teachers, however, we see the ethnic morality of the Jews giving way to an ethic which is spiritual and in the highest sense human.[2]

4) In the exaltation of the Christian virtues of gentleness, meekness, joy, peace, Paul approximates the ethical thought of

---

1 Quoted by Gardner, op.cit., p. 165. 2 Gardner, ibid., p.140.

Jesus. The exhortations of Col 3:15, I Cor 6:7, II Cor 10:1, Col 3:12, Rom 14:17, Gal 5:22, reproduce, sometimes consciously, the kindly outlook of Jesus. 5) Their inner ethical harmony is most completely demonstrated by their common exaltation of love. On this point particularly Paul's dependence on Jesus is clear. Judaism knew nothing like the practice of love which was characteristic of the early Christian communities. Paul might conceivably have got his idea of love from the law, but the ethical force it attained in his life and teaching can only be ascribed to the impact of the love of Christ on his life.[1]

Finally, it is Paul's conviction that he has the mind of Christ which prompts him to urge others to imitate him.[2] Clearly Paul is not asking his readers to regard him as a model of ethical conduct. He is asking that they look upon him as an example of the way in which Christ's mind works on that of another. Paul covets for them the same experience of Christ that he enjoys. Certainly he could never have made this appeal had he not himself possessed a clear picture of the moral character of Jesus.

---

1 Baillie, The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul, p. 159, writes,

> Where did Paul learn that 'the greatest thing of all is love'? There is, of course, but one answer. The new insight goes back, in the most direct way possible, to what Paul calls 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus.'

2 I Cor 4:16, 11:1; Phil 3:17, 4:9; I Thes 1:6, 2:14; II Thes 3:7, 9.

Jesus. The exhortations of Col 3:12, I Cor 6:7, II Cor 10:1, Gal 6:12, Rom 14:19, Gal 5:22, reproduce, sometimes consciously, the humbly outlook of Jesus. 5) Their inner ethical harmony is most completely demonstrated by their common exaltation of love. On this point particularly Paul's dependence on Jesus is clear. Judaism knew nothing like the practice of love which was characteristic of the early Christian communities. Paul might conceivably have got his idea of love from the law, but the ethical force it attained in his life and teaching can only be ascribed to the impact of the love of Christ on his life.[1]

Finally, it is Paul's conviction that he has the mind of Christ which prompts him to urge others to imitate him.[2] Clearly Paul is not asking his readers to regard him as a model of ethical conduct. He is asking that they look upon him in an example of the way in which Christ's mind works on that of another. Paul covets for them the same experience of Christ that he enjoys. Certainly he would never have made this appeal had he not himself possessed a clear picture of the moral character of Jesus.

---

1 Seeliie, The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul, p. 129, writes, 'Where did Paul learn that 'the greatest thing of all is love'? There is, of course, but one answer. The non-insight goes back, in the most direct way possible, to what Paul calls 'the mind which was in Christ Jesus.'

2 I Cor 4:16, 11:1; Phil 3:17, 4:9; I Thes 1:6, 2:14; II Thes 3:7, 9.

We conclude that the ethical dependence of Paul on Jesus is conditioned by the mystical relationship in which the two were joined. Paul's ethical teaching is the deliverance of his religious consciousness, the practical expression of his personal fellowship with Christ. Christ, the historical person, whose ethical standards are well known to Paul, inspires Paul to give to believers moral teachings compatible with his own, which Paul indeed regards as Christ's own. The dependence is thus inward, not outward. Paul rarely cites Jesus. Rather, he conceives himself to know and to be interpreting the mind of Christ. In his experience of Christ all Paul's ethical ideals are re-examined and re-motivated; as they pass through the prism of his Christ-experience, they are transformed, and appear in Paul's new life in different form and color. [1]

In view of this inner relationship between Paul and Jesus, the only fair test for the determination of the dependence of Paul on Jesus is the test of ethical harmony. This test has been applied. The results show that although couched in different language, and offered to varying groups of people, Paul's moral teaching coincides with that of Jesus to a remarkable degree. In Paul the pure religious idealism of Jesus is inwardly appropriated, then outwardly applied to the moral problems of first century men and women.

---

1 This expression was coined by Dr. W. J. Lowstuter.

We recognize that the ethical dependence of Paul on Seneca is conditioned by the marital relationship in which the two were joined. Paul's ethical teachings in the epistles of his relationship to Christ, the spiritual orientation of his personal fellowship with Christ. Christ, who liberated persons, whose spiritual elements are well known to Paul, has freed us to live in believers moral teachings <u>commitment to</u> his own, which Paul indeed regards as <u>Christ's own</u>. The dependence is thus inward, not outward. Paul merely cites Seneca, whose impressive integrity he knew and to be interpreting the mind of Christ. In this co-friendship of Christ all Paul's ethical ideals are re-evaluated and re-motivated, as they pass through the prism of his Christ-centered ethics. They are transformed, and wonder in Paul's new life in different form and color.[1]

In view of this inner relationship between Paul and Seneca, the only fair test for the determination of the dependence of Paul on Seneca is the test of ethical memory. This test has been fulfilled. The passages show they deliberately conceived in different language, and efforts to varying sense of morals, Paul's moral teaching coincides with that of Seneca to a remarkable degree. In fact one may also indicate inquiries of Seneca in inwardly as regulated, thus not merely similar to the moral problem of Paul or Seneca, but moral.

---

1. This expression was coined by Dr. W. C. Bowman.

New Ethical Standard

We may approach the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics from another angle. Paul's personal experience of the mystic Christ gave to his ethical teaching a new motivation. His ethical standard is life worthy of the mystic fellowship in which he and other believers are joined to Christ. This new ethical standard is developed in Romans 8, Galatians 5, and elsewhere, and is epitomized in the statements,

> they that are after the Spirit (mind)
> the things of the Spirit,[1]

and,

> Only let your manner of life be worthy
> of the gosepl of Christ.[2]

This standard, it will be observed, is mystico-ethical in character. Its appeal is to the preservation of the intimate personal relationship to Jesus Christ. The motive for right conduct is thus the kind of life Christ (or the Spirit) leads a man to live, and the sanction for ethical behavior is the maintenance of the mystic bond of fellowship.

In ordinary ethical systems the norms or standards for conduct from which moral precepts are deduced are usually arrived at by reason. The highest good is defined in terms, for example, of that which possesses universality or permanence. In the ethics of Paul the norms, standards, and sanctions employed are not arrived at by human reason, playing upon the data of ethics, but by mystical religious experience. Thus Paul's ethics differs widely from philosophical ethics. His ethical principles are not human

---

1 Rom 8:5. 2 Phil 1:27.

Ein Ethical Standard

He may approach the relation of Paul's apostolate to his ethics from another angle. Paul's personal experience of the mystic Christ gave to his ethical teaching a new motivation. His ethical standard in life worthy of the mystic fellowship in which he and other believers are joined to Christ. This new ethical standard is developed in Romans 6, Galatians 5, and elsewhere, and is epitomized in the epistleets.

> Only that are after the spirit (mind) the things of the spirit.[1]

and,

> Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ.[2]

This standard, it will be observed, is mystico-ethical in character. The appeal is to the preservation of the intimate personal relationship to Jesus Christ. The motive for right conduct is thus the kind of life Christ (or the spirit) leads a man to live, and the sanction for ethical behavior is the maintenance of the mystic bond of fellowship.

In ordinary ethical systems the norms or standards for conduct from which moral precepts are deduced are usually arrived at by reason. The highest good is defined in terms, for example, of that which possesses universality or permanence. In the ethics of Paul the norms, standards, and sanctions employed are not arrived at by human reason, playing upon the data of ethics, but by mystical religious experience. Thus Paul's ethics differs widely from philosophical ethics. His ethical principles are not human

---

1 Rom 8:5. 2 Phil 1:27.

in origin, but divine; his sanctions are grounded not in human reason, but in the revealed will of God, mystically apprehended through fellowship with Christ. His norms are written in terms of the mystical attachment of men in Christ.

In a sense, therefore, Paul's ethical standards are absolute, though not in the sense of establishing absolute and invariable moral precepts. To use a modern term, Paul is a perfectionist. His ethical standard is an ideal personality worthy of fellowship with Jesus Christ. The content of his ideal he never finally nor fully describes. He is content to allow each individual to interpret for himself what the moral implications of being in Christ are. His own personal interpretation of those moral implications we shall study in the next chapter.

Paul implements mysticism with morality

In the third place, we may state the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics by saying that Paul implements his mysticism with morality. That is, he fully expects that all those who are in right relationship with Jesus Christ will undergo moral renewal, and give evidence of their mystical relationship with Christ in good conduct. All the functions of the twice-born manifest a new moral aspect. All the activities of men and women in Christ have a moral side and significance.[1] Their conduct must comport

---

1 Arnold, op. cit., p. 56,
Paul's originality lies in the effort to find a moral side and significance for all the processes, however mystical, of the religious life, with a view of strengthening, in this way, their hold upon us and their command of all our nature.

in origin, but divine; his sanctions are grounded not in human reason, but in the revealed will of God, mystically apprehended through fellowship with Christ. His norms are written in terms of the mystical attachment of man in Christ.

In a sense, therefore, Paul's ethical norms are absolute, though not in the sense of establishing absolute and invariable moral procedure. To use a modern term, Paul is a personalist. His ethical standard is an ideal personality worthy of fellowship with Jesus Christ. The content of his ideal is never literally nor fully describable. He is content to allow each individual to interpret for himself what the moral implications of being in Christ are. His own personal interpretation of those moral implications we shall study in the next chapter.

Paul implements mysticism with morality

In the third place, we may state the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics by saying that Paul implements his mysticism with morality. That is, he fully expects that all those who are in right relationship with Jesus Christ will undergo moral renewal, and give evidence of their mystical relationship with Christ in good conduct. All the functions of the twice-born manifest a new moral aspect. All the activities of men and women in Christ have a moral side and significance.[1] Their conduct must conform

---

1 Arnold, op. cit., p. 50.
Paul's originality lies in the effort to find a moral side and significance for all the processes, however mystical, of the religious life, with a view of strengthening, in this way, their hold upon us and their command of all our nature.

with their mystical relationship with Christ. Because men are in Christ, they live a certain kind of moral life. Though he admitted, even championed the position, that salvation did not depend upon conduct, he was sure that conduct did matter,

> and he maintained that conduct would necessarily be governed by and show the results of salvation. There were certain things the saved man would not do. He was not saved because he did not do these things, but he did not do them because he was saved. . . to him the central point in life is what you are, not what you do, so that conduct necessarily follows nature.[1]

But let us allow Paul to verify this position by his own statements. Take first his statements in Romans 6 and 8:

> We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also might walk in newness of life;[2]
>
> knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away; . . .[3]
>
> Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof: neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness: but present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God;[4]
>
> For they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit;[5]

---

1 K. Lake, Paul, pp. 128-9. 2 Rom 6:4.

3 Rom 6:6. 4 Rom 6:12-14. 5 Rom 8:5.

with their mystical relationship with Christ. Because men are in Christ, they live a certain kind of moral life. Though he admitted, even emphasized the position, that salvation did not depend upon conduct, he was sure that conduct did matter.

> and he maintained that conduct would necessarily be governed by and show the results of salvation. There were certain things the saved man would not do. He was not saved because he did not do those things, but he did not do them because he was saved. . . So his central point in life is what you are, not what you do, as the two do not necessarily follow nature.[1]

Let us allow Paul to verify this position by his own statements. Take first his statements in Romans 6 and 8:

> We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead through the glory of the Father, so we also should walk in newness of life.[2]

> Knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, . . .[3]

> Let not sin therefore reign in your mortal body, that ye should obey the lusts thereof: neither present your members unto sin as instruments of unrighteousness: but present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God.[4]

> For they that are after the flesh mind the things of the flesh; but they that are after the Spirit the things of the Spirit.[5]

---

1 R. Lake, Paul, p. 128-9. 2 Rom 6:4.

3 Rom 6:6. 4 Rom 6:12-13. 5 Rom 8:5.

> But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his;[1]
>
> for if ye live after the flesh, ye must die; but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live.[2]

In these passages Paul is giving utterance to one of his most profound convictions: the conduct of the new life begun through mystical fellowship with God in Jesus Christ <u>is</u> moral, <u>must be</u> moral, to correspond with the moral nature of the divine being to whom it is related.

The same thought receives slightly different expression in the imprisonment letters. When Paul calls on the Philippians to

> work out your own salvation with fear and trembling,[3]

he is referring to the moral conduct of life which is the basis of all true fellowship with Christ. To the Ephesians he writes that it is only as they are

> rooted and grounded in love

that they may

> be strong to apprehend . . . what is the breadth and length and height and depth (of) the love of Christ.[4]

Again to the Ephesians he writes,

---

1 Rom 8:9. 2 Rom 8:13.

3 Phil 2:12. 4 Eph 3:17-18.

> But if any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.[1]
>
> For if ye live after the flesh, ye must die: but if by the Spirit ye put to death the deeds of the body, ye shall live.[2]

In these passages Paul is giving utterance to one of his most profound convictions: the conduct of the new life begun through spiritual fellowship with God in Jesus Christ is moral, must be moral, to correspond with the moral nature of the divine being by whom it is related.

The same thought receives slightly different expression in the imprisonment letters. When Paul calls on the Philippians to

> work out your own salvation with fear and trembling,[3]

he is referring to the moral conduct of life which is the basis of all true fellowship with Christ. To the Ephesians he writes that it is only as they are

> rooted and grounded in love

that they may

> be strong to apprehend . . . what is the breadth and length and height and depth (of) the love of Christ.[4]

Again to the Ephesians he writes,

---

1 Rom 8:9. 2 Rom 8:13.

3 Phil 2:12. 4 Eph 3:17-18.

> For we are his workmanship, created in Christ for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them.[1]

Paul's use of the idea of fruitage suggests the way in which he conceived the moral life to implement the believer's mystical relationship to Christ. He prays that the Philippians may be filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ;[2] he seeks for the fruit that increaseth to their account;[3] in Galatians the fruit of the Spirit is contrasted effectively with the works of the flesh.[4] Thus it is apparent that for Paul moral conduct is the spontaneous outgrowth of the mystical relationship in which believers stand to Christ. By the same inviolable logic which led Shakespeare to write,

> This above all, to thine own self be true;
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man,[5]

Paul asserts that when a man is joined to Christ, and is true to the character of Christ, it follows as the night the day that he will grow up into Christlikeness, and will bear moral fruit. The fundamental thought of Paul is,

> The religious man 'ought' not be moral, he is moral . . .[6]

Paul tests mysticism by morality

But Paul's teaching reveals a fourth aspect of the relationship of mysticism to morality. With him, as with all great and authentic mystics,

---

1 Eph 2:10. 2 Phil 1:11. 3 Phil 4:17. 4 Gal 5:19-24.
5 "Hamlet," I, 3. 6 Weinel, op. cit. p. 343.

> For we are his workmanship, created in Christ for good works, which God afore prepared that we should walk in them.[1]

Paul's use of the idea of fruit(s) suggests the way in which he conceived the moral life to implement the believer's mystical relationship to Christ. He prays that the Philippians may be filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ;[2] he seeks for the fruit that increases to their account;[3] in Galatians the fruit of the Spirit is contrasted effectively with the works of the flesh.[4] Thus it is apparent that for Paul moral conduct is the spontaneous outgrowth of the mystical relationship in which believers stand to Christ. By the same invioiable logic which led Shakespeare to write,

> This above all, to thine own self be true;
> And it must follow, as the night the day,
> Thou canst not then be false to any man.[5]

Paul asserts that when a man is joined to Christ, and is true to the character of Christ, it follows as the night the day that he will grow up into Christlikeness, and will bear moral fruit. The fundamental thought of Paul is,

> The religious man 'ought' not to be moral, he is moral . . .[6]

Paul basis mysticism by morality But Paul's teaching reveals a fourth aspect of the relationship of mysticism to morality. With him, as with all great and authentic mystics,

---

1 Eph 2:10. 2 Phil 1:11. 3 Phil 4:17. 4 Gal 5:16-24.
5 "Hamlet," I, 3. 6 Reinach, op. cit. p. 212.

morality is a test of the reality and value of mystical experience. Mere assertion on the part of believers that they are in Christ, or in the Spirit, is inadequate; they must give evidence of moral transformation. So he counsels the Galatians,

> But let each man prove his own work,. . .[1]

and the Corinthians,

> Try your own selves, whether ye are in the faith; prove your own selves.[2]

The final test of the validity of spiritual functions is always ethical. In dealing with the disturbances at Corinth this test is rigorously applied:

> Es sind also ethische Mangel: das Fehlen von Liebe, Friede, und Demut, aus denen Paulus folgert, dass sie noch nicht vom Geiste durchdrungen sind. Damit sind die Gesichtspunkte gegeben, an denen es sich auch sonst nach Paulus entschiedet, ob der Geist wirksam geworden ist oder nicht.[3]

In the sixth chapter of I Corinthians we see clearly how Paul reproaches his converts for moral failures which destroy their original relationship with Christ,

> . . it is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. . . know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men,

---

1 Gal 6:4. 2 I Cor 13:5.

3 K. Deissner, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit, Leipzig: Deichert, 1921, S. 27.

morality is a test of the reality and value of spiritual experience. Here assertion on the part of believers that they are in Christ, or in the Spirit, is inadequate; they must give evidence of moral transformation. So he counsels the Galatians,

> Let let each man prove his own work. . . .[1]

and the Corinthians,

> Try your own selves, whether ye are in the faith; prove your own selves.[2]

The final test of the validity of spiritual experience is always ethical. In dealing with the fornication at Corinth this test is vigorously applied:

> Ye wind also ethische Umwel: des Fehlen von Liebe, Friede, und Demut, aus denen Fauler Folgen, dass sie noch nicht von Geiste durch wegen sind. Damit sind die Gestaltes- phase gesehen, in denen es sich noch sonst noch Wulne enthalten, ob nur Geist vinkeen gewurden ist oder nicht.[3]

In the sixth chapter of I Corinthians we see clearly how Paul reproaches his converts for moral failures which destroy their spiritual relationship with Christ.

> . . It is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. . . Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God? Be not deceived; neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with men,

---

1 Gal 6:4. 2 I Cor 13:5.

3 A. Deissner, Paulus und die mystik seiner Zeit, Leipzig: Deichert, 1921, p. 27.

> nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit the kingdom of God. And such were some of you: but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified, but ye were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.[1]

In this passage we see the truth of our last two assertions illustrated: Paul expects relationship with Christ to issue in moral conduct, and he uses moral conduct as a test of mystical experience. Similar illustration is offered by I Corinthians 13, where Paul exalts the power of love, not only as an expression of man's fellowship with Christ, but as a test of it. The gifts of tongues, prophecy, and faith are as sounding brass and clanging cymbal without love. Without belittling the gifts, or subordinating them, Paul declares their inevitable accompaniment to be love. He never relaxes his hold upon the ethical element as the test of the mystical.

> If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.[2]

> For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are the Sons of God.[3]

Faith and Love in Paul

The great common denominator of Paul's mysticism and ethics is the all-pervasive and sovereign power of <u>love</u>. The mystical fellowship which the believer enjoys in Christ is a fellowship of love. The spirit of Christ is the spirit of love. It is this fact which explains the elements of

---

1 I Cor 6:7-11. 2 Rom 8:9.

3 Rom 8:14.

nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards,
nor revilers, nor extortioners, shall inherit
the kingdom of God. And such were some of
you: but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified,
but ye were justified in the name of the Lord
Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God.[1]

In this passage we see the truth of our last two assertions illustrated: Paul expects relationship with Christ to issue in moral conduct, and he uses moral conduct as a test of spiritual experience. Similar illustration is offered by I Corinthians 13, where Paul exalts the power of love, not only as an expression of man's relationship with Christ, but as a test of it. The gifts of tongues, prophecy, and faith are as sounding brass and clanging cymbal without love. Without bolstering the gifts, or subordinating them, Paul declares their inevitable accompaniment to be love. In never relegate its hold upon the ethical element as the test of the spiritual.

If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ,
he is none of his.[2]

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God,
these are the Sons of God.[3]

Faith and love is fact

The great common denominator of Pauline mysticism and ethics is the all-pervasive and sovereign power of love. The spiritual fellowship which the believer enjoys in Christ is a fellowship of love. The merits of Christ is the spirit of love. It is this fact which explains the elements of

---

1 I Cor 6:9-11. 2 Rom 8:9.

3 Rom 8:14.

mutuality in the relation of his mysticism to his ethics. Faith is the name Paul gives to the mystical process by which the believer apprehends and holds fast ultimate love, the love of God in Christ. Love is the moral expression of faith. The experience of being in Christ manifests itself functionally in loving attitudes toward all God's creatures.

Love for Paul is therefore more than an ethical principle or moral virtue: it is a mystic fact. It takes its rise not in ethical theorizing, nor in the application of reason to moral problems, but in mystical fellowship with him who is Love. It carries a greater-than-human sanction, for it is of the nature of God himself.

> Because He Himself (Christ) is love there streams over Paul the power of love as the power of ethical action.[1]

Thus when Paul looks at the relationship with Christ from the standpoint of the spiritual attachment of the believer to Christ, he calls the relationship faith; but when he looks at the same relationship from the standpoint of its functioning in practical conduct, he calls the relationship love. The natural expression of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics as found in Gal 5:6 is therefore quite intelligible, and profoundly true to his experience: "in Christ Jesus" nothing avails "but faith working through love."

---

1 Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 250.

mutuality in the relation of his mysticism to his ethics. *Faith* is the name Paul gives to the mystical process by which the believer apprehends and holds fast divine love. The love of God in Christ, *Love* is the moral expression of faith. The experience of being in Christ manifests itself functionally in loving attitudes toward all God's creatures.

Love for Paul is therefore more than an ethical principle or moral virtue: it is a mystic fact. It takes its rise not in ethical theorizing, nor in the application of reason to moral problems, but in mystical fellowship with him who is love. It carries a greater-than-human sanction, for it is of the nature of God himself.

> Because St Ignatius (Christ) is love there stresses over Paul the power of love as the power of ethical action.[1]

Thus when Paul looks at the relationship with Christ from the standpoint of the spiritual attainment of the believer to Christ, he calls the relationship *faith*; but when he looks at the same relationship from the standpoint of its functioning in practical conduct, he calls the relationship *love*. The natural expression of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics as found in Gal 5:6 is therefore quite intelligible, and profoundly true to his experience: "In Christ Jesus" nothing avails "*but faith working through love*."

---

1 Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, p. 190.

Love is the function of faith; moral life is the expression of mystical experience.

The underlying assumption of Paul's entire religious experience is that God is a loving Father; that he becomes real and dynamic in the personality of his Son, Jesus Christ; that through mystical fellowship with Christ every element of his being, every function of his personality, is inspired and directed toward godly conduct. His ethics is therefore not mere ethics, but religious ethics, Christian ethics, and according to our thesis, mystico-ethics.

Paul was not a moral reformer, but a Christian missionary. His one passion was to save the souls of people through relating them to God in Christ Jesus. His primary aim was not to help people attain moral values, but to attain salvation by faith in Christ. Thus the real aim of all his moral teaching is to prevent the souls of his believers from being lost; he was moving in accord with his conviction that "no unrighteous man can inherit the kingdom of God." Moral regeneration did of course issue from his work and teaching; but

> what the apostle has before his eyes is not a world ethically organized, a moral civilization, but a world doomed to destruction, in which individuals saved by religion keep themselves pure and unspotted.[1]

Paul's Christ-mysticism was so intense, so all-absorbing,

---

1 Weinel, St. Paul, the Man and His Work, pp. 330-331.

love is the function of faith; moral life is the expression of mystical experience.

The underlying assumption of Paul's entire religious experience is that God is a loving Father; that he becomes real and dynamic in the personality of his Son, Jesus Christ; that through mystical fellowship with Christ, every element of his being, every function of his personality, is inspired and directed toward godly conduct. His ethics is therefore not mere ethics, but religious ethics, Christian ethics, and according to our thesis, mystico-ethics.

Paul was not a moral reformer, but a Christian missionary. His one passion was to save the souls of people through relating them to God in Christ Jesus. His primary aim was not to help people attain moral values, but to attain salvation by faith in Christ. Thus the real aim of all his moral teaching is to prevent the souls of his believers from being lost; he was moving in accord with his conviction that "no unrighteous man can inherit the kingdom of God." Moral regeneration did of course issue from his work and teaching; but

> what the apostle has before his eyes is not a world ethically organized, a moral civilization, but a world doomed to destruction, in which individuals saved by religion keep themselves pure and unspotted.[1]

Paul's Christ-mysticism was so intense, so all-absorbing,

---

1 Weinel, St. Paul, The Man and His Work, pp. 320-321.

that his every approach to life was conditioned by it. However distinct mysticism and morality may appear when studied historically or psychologically, it must be acknowledged that Paul's point of view was so exclusively religious that, as Weinel puts it,

> morality has no independent significance in his theory. All faith, all religion, is nothing to him if it be not transmuted into love.[1]

---

1 Weinel, op. cit., p. 330.

Chapter IX

The Mystico-Ethical Formulation

of

Paul's Practical Teaching

Mystico-Ethical Formulation of Paul's Practical Teaching

Paul's practical teaching concerning right conduct among his believers is conditioned by and formulated in terms of his mystical religious experience. The various aspects of the relation of his mysticism to his ethics noted in the previous chapter find ready illustration in the voluminous moral teaching of his letters.

Individual morality καινὴ κτίσις

We turn first to Paul's teaching on individual morality to observe its mystico-ethical formulation.

> Wherefore, if any man is in Christ, he is a καινὴ κτίσις : the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.[1]

The καινὴ κτίσις of Paul must be viewed as a superb stroke of his creative religious genius. The transformation wrought in his life by the Damascus experience was so revolutionary that it can be expressed only as a re-creation.[2] καινὴ κτίσις is a mystico-ethical term. On the one hand it suggests the new relationship of the individual to divine power. The man-in-Christ is the new creation. Paul's thought of the power of the supernatural working in man is bound up in this conception. The new life is the explicit and undeniable work of God through Christ. On the other hand καινὴ κτίσις suggests the moral transformation of the individual.

---

1 II Cor 5:17.

2 This verse (II Cor 5:17) is to be regarded as a confession, "a clear reflexion of Paul's conversion experience." - Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 225.

Mystico-ethical formulation of Paul's practical teaching

Paul's practical teaching concerning right conduct among his believers is conditioned by and formulated in terms of his mystical religious experience. The various aspects of the relation of his mysticism to his ethics noted in the previous chapter find ready illustration in the voluminous moral teaching of his letters.

Individual morality

We turn first to Paul's teaching on individual morality to observe his mystico-ethical formulation.

> Wherefore, if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation: the old things are passed away; behold, they are become new.[1]

The new creation of Paul must be viewed as a superb stroke of his creative religious genius. The transformation wrought in his life by the Damascus experience was so revolutionary that it can be expressed only as a re-creation.[2] Kaine ktisis is a mystico-ethical term. On the one hand it suggests the new relationship of the individual to divine power. The man-in-Christ is the new creation. Paul's thought of the power of the supernatural working in man is bound up in this conception. The new life is the explicit and undeniable work of God through Christ. On the other hand kaine ktisis suggests the moral transformation of the individual.

---

1 II Cor 5:17.

2 This verse (II Cor 5:17) is to be regarded as a confession, "a close reflection of Paul's conversion experiences" - Deissmann, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul, p. 222.

> The old condition of things passed away when he entered into that relation, and a new condition took its place.[1]

Elsewhere Paul uses similar terms to denote this renovation of character through fellowship with Jesus Christ. In Gal 6:15 he says,

> For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature,

or, as some translators render it,

> a new act of creation.[2]

Here κτίσις

> is probably to be taken in its active sense, referring to the divine activity in the production of a new moral life, but the emphasis is not upon this aspect of the matter but upon the radical transformation of character implied in the choice of such a word as κτίσις, 'creation,' and the addition of καινή, 'new.'[3]

κτίσις is used in the New Testament in two ways: a) as a verbal noun, meaning "act of creation," as in Romans 1:20, κτίσεως κόσμου; b) as a concrete noun equivalent to κτίσμα, either i) individually, "a created thing or person," as in Rom 8:39, Heb 4:13, or ii) collectively, the sum of created things, or the total of a particular class of created things, as in Rev 3:14, Rom 8:22. In II Cor 5:17 κτίσις is used in the concrete (passive) sense. But Burton thinks that in Gal 6:15 it is used (in antithesis to περιτομή and ακροβυστία)

---

1 Plummer, "II Cor", (I C C), p. 165. 2 Burton, "Gal" (I C C), p. 347.

3 Ibid, p. 356.

The old condition of things passed away when he entered into that relation, and a new condition took its place.[1]

Plummer feel uses similar terms to denote this removal of character through following with Jesus Christ. In Gal 6:15 he says,

> For neither is circumcision anything, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature,

or, as some translations render it,

> a new order of creation.[2]

Kaine Ktisis

> is probably to be taken in the active sense, referring to the divine activity in the production of a new moral life, but the emphasis is not upon this aspect of the matter but upon the radical transformation of character implied in the choice of such a word as Ktisis, 'creation,' and the addition of kainos, 'new.'[3]

Ktisis is used in the New Testament in two ways: a) as a verbal noun, meaning "act of creation," as in Romans 1:20, [illegible]; b) as a concrete noun equivalent to ktisma, either i) individually, "a created thing or person," as in Rom 8:39, Heb 4:13, or ii) collectively, the sum of created things, or the total of a particular class of created things, as in Rev 3:14, Rom 8:22. In II Cor 5:17 kaine ktisis is used in the concrete (passive) sense. But Burton thinks that in Gal 6:15 it is used (in antithesis to [illegible] and [illegible]

---

1. Plummer, "II Cor", (I C C) p. 165. 2. Burton, "Gal" (I C C) p. 347.
3. Ibid, p. 348.

in the verbal (actional) sense.[1]

In the comparable passage, Gal 5:6, the futility of circumcision and uncircumcision is contrasted with πίστις δι' ἀγάπης ἐνεργουμένη. Here πίστις and ἀγάπη are

> purely ethical terms, descriptive of the fundamental moral attitude of the Christian.[2]

But in Gal 6:15 καινὴ κτίσις

> is, on the one side, less definite as to the moral character of the new life, . . . and on the other hand, directs attention to the radical change involved rather than to the external expression of the moral quality of the life thus produced.[3]

In all these instances the fusion of the mystical and ethical is discernible. Paul has in mind the moral transformation wrought by the love of God as it is mystically apprehended by the believer.

This conception of a new creation is characteristic of Paul's experience, thought, and teaching. He refers to the "newness of life" of the man who has been "buried in baptism" and "like as Christ . . . raised from the dead through the glory of the Father."[4] "Newness of spirit" supplants "oldness of the letter" in those who "have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were held."[5] He enjoins the Romans:

> And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.[6]

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), p.356. 2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. 4 Rom 6:4. 5 Rom 7:6.

6 Rom 12:2; cf. Ep 4:23.

in the verbal (notional) sense.[1]

In the comparable passage, Gal 6:6, the fundamental alienation and nonrecognition is contrasted with mere [illegible] [illegible]. Here [illegible] and [illegible] are

> purely ethical terms, descriptive of the fundamental moral attitude of the Christian.[2]

But in Gal 6:15 Kaino writes

> is, on the one side, less definite as to the moral character of the man "in Christ" . . . and on the other hand, directs attention to the radical change involved rather than to the external expression of the moral quality of the life thus produced.[3]

In all these instances the fusion of the mystical and ethical is discernible. Paul has in mind the moral transformation wrought by the love of God as it is mystically apprehended by the believer.

This conception of a new creation is characteristic of Paul's experience, thought, and teaching. He refers to the "newness of life" of the man who has been "buried in baptism" and "life as Christ . . . raised from the dead through the glory of the Father."[4] "Newness of spirit" supplants "oldness of the letter" in those who "have been discharged from the law, having died to that wherein we were held."[5] He exhorts the Romans

> And be not fashioned according to this world; but be ye transformed by the renewing of your mind, that ye may prove what is the good and acceptable and perfect will of God.[6]

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I.C.C.), p.356. 2 Ibid.

3 Ibid. 4 Rom 6:4. 5 Rom 7:6.

6 Rom 12:2; cf. Eph 4:23.

ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος
ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος

The two figures by which Paul amplifies his mystico-ethical appeal to his readers are the "old man" (ὁ παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος) and the "new man" (ὁ καινὸς ἄνθρωπος).

> . . knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away. (Rom 6:6)
>
> . . that ye put away, . . . the old man, that waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit. (Eph 4:22)
>
> . . seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings . (Col 3:9)
>
> and put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth. (Eph 4:24)
>
> . . and have put on the new man, (νέον ἄνθρωπον) that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him. (Col 3:10)

"Put off - put on"
ἐνδύω

The putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new are conceived by Paul as involving vastly more than a change of moral raiment. The verb ἐνδύω (ἐνδύνω) which Paul uses in both Ephesians and Colossians is likewise used in Gal 3:27 and Rom 13:14, where it is not the new man, but Christ, who is "put on." We know from our previous study that putting on Christ is for Paul a thorough-going, life-transforming experience. The man in Christ lives in a different moral atmosphere; his ways of conduct are cleansed, elevated, ennobled. To put on Christ means for Paul to become as Christ.[1]

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), p. 203.

c. Πάλαιος ἀνθρωπος
ὁ καινὸς ἀνθρωπος

The two figures by which Paul amplifies his exhortation-e.kind equal to his readers are the "old man" (ὁ παλαιὸς ἀνθρωπος) and the "new man" (ὁ καινὸς ἀνθρωπος).

. . knowing this, that our old man was crucified with him, that the body of sin might be done away, (Rom 6:6)

. . that ye put away, ... the old man, that waxeth corrupt after the lusts of deceit. (Eph 4:22)

. . seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings . (Col 3:9)

and put on the new man, that after God hath been created in righteousness and holiness of truth. (Eph 4:24)

. . and have put on the new man, (νέον ἀνθρωπον) that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him. (Col 3:10)

"put off - put on" evidence

The putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new are conceived by Paul as involving vastly more than a change of moral raiment. The word evidence (ἐνδύω) which Paul uses in both Ephesians and Colossians is likewise used in Gal 3:27 and Rom 13:14. There it is not the new man, but Christ, who is "put on." We know from our previous study that putting on Christ is for Paul a thoroughgoing, life-transforming experience. The man in Christ lives in a different moral atmosphere; his ways of conduct are cleansed, elevated, ennobled. To put on Christ means for Paul to become an Christ.[1]

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I.C.C), p. 206.

The distinct moral implications of putting on the new man and putting off the old are revealed in the passages just quoted from Ephesians and Colossians. Thus, in the passage in Ephesians, which begins with exhortations to put off the old and put on the new, Paul breaks forth in a series of pointed moral admonitions.[1] The same is true of the similar passage in Colossians, where the injunction to

> put off the old man with his doings,[2]

is prefaced with the command to

> put to death . . your members which are upon the earth, . . . put away . . . anger, wrath, shameful speaking . . . (etc.),[3]

and immediately followed by a) the famous statement concerning the leveling of racial and class barriers,[4] and b) the series of positive moral attitudes and practices which are, in conformity to the "new man," to be "put on."[5] In each case Paul expects that having put off the vices of the old man, his readers will put on the virtues of the new.

Dying and Rising - Initiatory rite or mystico-ethical sanction?

The interpenetration of the mystical and the ethical in Paul's practical teaching is shown in the way he relates the mystical doctrine of dying and rising to the ethical transformation wrought by putting

---

1 Eph 4:25-32, continuing indeed to the end of the chapter.

2 Col 3:9. 3 Col 3:5-8. 4 Col 3:11.

5 Col 3:12 - 4:6.

The distinct moral implications of putting on the new man and putting off the old are revealed in the passages just quoted from Ephesians and Colossians. Thus, in the passage in Ephesians, which begins with exhortations to put off the old and put on the new, Paul breaks forth in a series of polished moral admonitions.[1] The same is true of the similar passage in Colossians, where the injunction to

> put off the old man with his deeds,[2]

is preceded with the command to

> put to death . . . your members which are upon the earth, . . . put away . . . anger, wrath, malicious speaking . . . (Col.).[3]

and immediately followed by a) the famous statement concerning the levelling of racial and class barriers,[4] and b) the series of positive moral attitudes and practices which are, in conformity to the "new man," to be "put on."[5] In each case Paul expects that having put off the vices of the old man, the readers will put on the virtues of the new.

Dying and Rising - Initiatory rite or mystico-ethical sacrament?	The interpenetration of the mystical and the ethical in Paul's practical teaching is shown in the way he relates the mystical doctrine of dying and rising to the ethical transformation wrought by putting

---

1 Eph 4:25-32, culminating indeed in the end of the chapter.

2 Col 3:9. 3 Col 3:5-8. 4 Col 3:11.

5 Col 3:12 - 4:6.

off the old man and putting on the new. By participating mystically in the dying and rising of Christ, believers signify their transition from moral impotence to moral vitality. This participation he identifies with the rite of baptism.

> Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead . . so we also might walk in newness of life.[1]
>
> For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.[2]

Now it is common knowledge that the Mystery Religions of Paul's time made use of an initiatory rite similar to the rite of baptism. The rite varied in form according to the differences among the cults which employed it. The Taurobolium[3] is one of the more spectacular forms of the rite, but there were many others. In all, the common purpose was to induct the neophyte into the cult-mystery with impressive ceremony, so that he would thereafter feel himself to be identified with deity. In many of the cults the rite was repeated a number of times, it being found necessary to restore wayward members to their original vivid experience of the mystery.[4]

---

1 Rom 6:3-4. 2 Gal 3:27.

3 Taurobolium, -

> To the accompaniment of a dirge the neophyte descended into a latticed pit as into a grave. Above him a steer was killed: and when he emerged bespattered with the sacrificial blood, he was greeted as a god. He was <u>renatus in aeternum,</u> born again into eternity.
>
> - W. Morgan, <u>Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 131.</u>

4 Further development of Mystery Religions, cf. G.F. Moore, <u>History of Religion</u>, I, p.442 f., Cumont, <u>The Mysteries of Mithra</u>, p. 191,et cetera.

off the old man and nothing on the new. By partaking symbolically in the dying and rising of Christ, believers signify their transition from moral impotence to moral vitality. This participation in identifies with the rite of baptism.

> Are ye ignorant that all we who were baptized into Christ Jesus were baptized into his death? We were buried therefore with him through baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised from the dead . . so we also might walk in newness of life.[1]
>
> For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.[2]

Now it is common knowledge that the mystery religions of Paul's time made use of an initiatory rite similar to the rite of baptism. The rite varied in form according to the difference among the cults which employed it. The Taurobolium[3] is one of the more spectacular forms of the rite, but there were many others. In all, the common purpose was to induct the neophyte into the cult-mystery with impressive ceremony, so that he would thereafter feel himself to be identified with deity. In many of the cults the rite was repeated a number of times, it being found necessary to restore wayward members to their original vivid experience of the mystery.[4]

---

1 Rom 6:3-4. 2 Gal 3:27.

3 Taurobolium. -
To the accompaniment of a dirge the neophyte descended into a lattice pit as into a grave. Above him a steer was killed; and when he emerged reddened with the sanguinal blood, he was greeted as a god. In this regalia he returned, were again into obscurity.
- W. Morgan, Religion and Theology of Paul, p. 121.

4 Further development of mystery religions, cf. G. S. Moore, History of Religion, I, p.422 f.; Cumont, The Mysteries of Mithra, p. 161, et seq.

Does Paul conceive baptism, with its symbolism of dying and rising, in the same sense as that in which the Mystery Religions conceived their initiatory rites? O. Pfleiderer believes that Paul was influenced by the Mysteries in his use of baptism. He contends that Paul made baptism

> a Christian Mystery or ritual of initiation into the mystical union with the crucified and risen Lord. He sees in the immersion of the candidate not only a symbol, but a mystical reproduction of the burial and resurrection of Christ, whereby the baptized person becomes partaker of both in such way that so far as concerns his 'old man' or sinful body, he is buried with Christ, and as a 'new man' is raised up with Him and made partaker of His new heavenly and spiritual life. . . The reverse, positive, side of this initiation into Christ's death is described (Col 2:12) as 'being raised together with Christ,' and in Gal 3:27 as 'putting on Christ.' To understand Paul's meaning here it is necessary to recall the practice of certain cults: the celebrants put on garments, and even the mask of their god, in order thereby to indicate and to induce a feeling of self-identification with the god, by an incarnation or indwelling in them of his supernatural spiritual being. It is precisely this idea of an identification with Christ effected by means of baptism which Paul seems to have desired to express in 'putting on Christ.'[1]

Though Paul may have been influenced unconsciously by the Mysteries, there are too many differences, not only between his use of baptism and the Mysteries' use of the initiatory rite, but also between the

---

1 O. Pfleiderer, Primitive Christianity, Vol. I., pp. 414-416.

religion of the Mysteries and the religion of Paul,[1] to allow for his direct dependence upon or patterning after the Mysteries. In Paul's use of baptism there are lacking the elements of magic, secrecy, priestcraft, and deification common to the Mysteries, just as there is present a universalism and a moral earnestness unknown to the Mysteries.

This suggests precisely the element of real significance in Paul's use of the rite of baptism, with its dying and rising, its "putting off" the old man and "putting on" the new, - the moral element. Paul adopted these metaphors with the purpose of influencing the moral behavior of his Christian converts. The initiatory aspect of baptism is of secondary importance.[2] It is the death of the old self and the birth of the new that Paul symbolizes so effectively in

---

1 On the differences between Christianity and the Mysteries, see T. G. Tucker, Life in the Roman World of Nero and Paul, pp. 106-112; H.A.A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 247 f.; Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, pp. 199-201; The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 270; C.A.A. Scott, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 126, 240.

2 Schweitzer and Deissmann are at odds on this point. Deissman, Paul, p. 145 says:

> The assertion that according to Paul baptism is the means of access to Christ, I hold to be incorrect. . . In Paul's case, at all events, baptism was not the deciding factor, but the Christophany at Damascus, and not baptism, but preaching the gospel was in his view the purpose of his apostleship.

Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 18, attacks this position by saying that Paul asserts

> that it is with Baptism that the being-in-Christ and the dying and rising again have their beginning. He who is baptized into Christ is united in one corporeity with Him and the other Elect who are ' in Christ.' (Gal 3:27-28.)

Our own position favors that of Deissmann. Not the rite of baptism, but an inner relationship with the personality of Christ, established at Damascus, marks the genesis of Paul's Christ-mysticism.

religion of the Mysteries and the religion of Paul,[1] so allow for his direct dependence upon or participation after the Mysteries. In Paul's use of baptism there are lacking the elements of magic, sorcery, pleroforeit, and deification common to the Mysteries, but as there is present a universalism and a moral earnestness unknown to the Mysteries.

This suggests precisely the element of real significance in Paul's use of the rite of baptism, with the dying and rising, his "putting off" the old man and "putting on" the new, - the moral element. Paul adopted these metaphors with the purpose of influencing the moral behavior of his christian converts. The initiatory aspect of baptism is of secondary importance.[2] It is the death of the old self and the birth of the new that Paul symbolizes so effectively in

---

1 On the differences between Christianity and the Mysteries, see E. O. Taylor, Life in the Roman World of Nero and Paul, pp. 102-112; H. A. A. Kennedy, St. Paul and the Mystery Religions, p. 247 f.; Angus, The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, pp. 189-201; The Mystery Religions and Christianity, p. 170; G. A. Barton, Christianity According to St. Paul, p. 128, 240.

2 Schweitzer and Deissmann are at odds on this point. Deissmann, Paul, p. 145 says:

> The assertion that according to Paul baptism is the means of access to christ, I hold to be incorrect. . . . In Paul's case, at all events, baptism was not the decisive factor, but the christophany at Damascus, and not baptism, but crucifixion the moment was in his view the purpose of his apostleship.

Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, p. 15, defends this position by saying that Paul asserts

> that it is with Christ that the being-in-Christ and the dying and rising again have their beginning. He who is baptized into Christ is united in one corporeity with him and the other dead who are ' in Christ.' (Rom 6:27-28.)

Our own position favors that of Deissmann. But the rite of baptism, but an inner relationship with the personality of Christ, established at Damascus, marks the genesis of Paul's Christ-mysticism.

these expressions. How are Paul's frequent references[1] to dying and rising to be explained if not as the expression of his solicitude for the moral condition of his readers? When he alludes to Christ's death, he has in mind death to sin, the putting off of the old man, the elimination of the fleshly impulses: Rom 6:10,11; Gal 5:24, 6:14; when he alludes to the resurrection, he has in mind the rise to new moral life: Rom 6:4. Paul laid hold on those terms which describe the redemptive work of Christ (death, burial, resurrection), and put them to practical, though figurative use. He sought to stimulate in his readers a moral renewal which had its prime cause in Christ's work. What we have therefore in this group of expressions is a strong mystico-ethical sanction for right conduct. Paul's chief aim was evangelical; he sought to lead men to the attainment of righteousness, or acceptance with God. His own experience was mystical; he came into acceptance with God by faith. He makes his moral appeal on the basis of the personal fellowship with God which comes by faith. The new creature is a Christ-enlivened personality; he has put away all that is fleshly; he is alive to all that is good. Good conduct is the inevitable accompaniment

---

1 Gal 2:19, 20; 5:24; 6:14; II Cor 5:17; Rom 6:2, 6, 7, 10, 11 13; 7:4, 6; 8:1, 2, 10; Phil 3:11.

three expressions. How are Paul's frequent references[1] to dying and rising to be explained if not as the expression of his solicitude for the moral condition of his readers? When he alludes to Christ's death, he has in mind death to sin, the putting off of the old man, the elimination of the fleshly influence: Rom 6:10,11; Gal 5:24, 6:14; when he alludes to the resurrection, he has in mind the rise to new moral life: Rom 6:4. Paul lets hold on those terms which describe the redemptive work of Christ (death, burial, resurrection), and put them to practical, though figurative use. He sought to stimulate in his readers a moral renewal which had the prime cause in Christ's work. Thus we have therefore in this group of expressions is a strong psycho-ethical exaltation for right conduct. Paul's ethical aim was very clear; he sought to lead men to the attainment of righteousness, or acceptance with God. His own experience was typical: he came into acceptance with God by faith. He makes his moral appeal on the basis of the personal fellowship with God which comes by faith. The new creature is a Christ-delivered personality: he has put away all that is fleshly; he is alive to all that is good. Good conduct is the inevitable accompaniment

---

1 Gal 5:16, 25; 6:24; 6:14; II Cor 5:17; Rom 8:5, 6, 7, 10, 11 13; Eph 4; 6; 6:1, 5, 10; Phil 3:11.

of the Christ-relationship.[1]

Thus in the formulation of his moral teaching Paul is still the religious mystic. He cannot, indeed, will not, move out of the religious realm in dealing with moral problems. Wrong is sin, right is righteousness; good is newness of life, bad is an indication of faulty spiritual relationship. The καινὴ κτίσις, the παλαιὸς ἄνθρωπος and the καινὸς ἄνθρωπος, are mystico-ethical conceptions which Paul uses with penetration and force in his practical moral teaching.

Moral functions of the καινὴ κτίσις

The specific moral admonitions of Paul thus grow out of his conception of the man in Christ as a καινὴ κτίσις. The Christian virtues which he enjoins are formulated in terms of his mystico-ethic. We can illustrate this by reference to his teaching on a number of practical moral matters.

---

1 Matthew Arnold, St. Paul and Protestantism, pp. 75-78, calls Paul's doctrine of necrosis the original mark of his religion.

> Paul calls into play the elemental power of sympathy and emotion in us, and sets it to work. But one unalterable object is assigned by him to this power: to die with Christ to the law of the flesh, to live with Christ to the law of the mind. Those multitudinous motions of appetite and self will which reason and conscience disapproved, reason and conscience could not govern, and had to yield to them. (But Paul's faith, drawing on great emotional power) enabled him to say, Die to them! Christ did . . If you are one with Him by faith and sympathy, you can die to them also . . you (then) become transformed by the renewing of your mind, and rise with Him.

of the Christ-relationship.[1]

Thus in the formulation of his moral teaching Paul is still the religious mystic. He cannot, indeed, will not, move out of the religious realm in dealing with moral problems. Wrong is sin, right is righteousness; good is newness of life, bad is an indication of faulty spiritual relationship. The words ἀγάπη, the ἀγάπη ἀνθρώπου and the ἀγάπη θεοῦ, are mystico-ethical conceptions which Paul uses with penetration and force in his practical moral teaching.

Moral functions of the specific moral admonitions of Paul thus grow out of his conception of the man in Christ as a νέα κτίσις. The Christian virtues which he enjoins are formulated in terms of his mystico-ethic. We can illustrate this by reference to his teaching on a number of practical moral matters.

---

1. Matthew Arnold, St. Paul and Protestantism, pp. 75-76, calls Paul's doctrine of conversion the original work of his religion.

Paul calls into play the elemental power of sympathy and emotion in us, and sets it to work. But one unalterable object is assigned by him to this power: to the will bended to the law of the Friend, to live with Christ to the law of the mind. Those multitudinous motives of sympathy and love will which reason and conscience disapproved, reason and conscience could not govern, and had to yield to them. (But Paul's faith, resting on great emotional power, enabled him to say, He to them! Christ-ridden . . . If you are one with him by faith and sympathy, you can die to them also . . you (then) become transformed by the renewing of your mind, and rise with him.

1) Physical self-control — Paul urges his readers to control and discipline their bodies; he advocates physical cleanliness, purity, and freedom from defilement. His appeal is always to the personal, mystical relationship which believers sustain to Christ. Every physical indulgence which hampers or impedes the full play of Christ in their lives is to be checked and eliminated. The mystico-ethical character of the sanction he invokes is revealed in I Cor 6:20,

> Glorify God therefore in your bodies,

in Rom 12:1,

> I beseech you therefore, brethren, . .
> to present your bodies a living
> sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God,
> which is your spiritual service,

and in the appeal which he makes to his own self-control,

> I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage.[1]

Paul warns against all perversions and indulgences of the sexual appetite: against homosexuality,[2] incest,[3] fornication,[4] and adultery.[5] Here the mystico-ethical formulation of his teaching is remarkably clear. Paul objects to these vices not primarily because they are injurious to physical well-being but because they sever the bond which relates believers to Christ. Accordingly, his appeal to the church at Corinth to get rid of the incestuous

---

1 I Cor 9:27. 2 Rom 1:26-27. 3 I Cor 5:1-13.

4 I Cor 6:13-20. 5 Rom 2:22; 13:9; I Cor 6:9.

1) Physical disciplined

Paul urges his readers to control and discipline their bodies; he advocates physical cleanliness, purity, and freedom from defilement. His appeal is always to the rational, spiritual relationship which believers sustain to Christ. Every physical impulse which hampers or impedes the full play of Christ in their lives is to be checked and eliminated. The mystico-ethical character of the sanction he invokes is revealed in I Cor 6:20,

(Glorify God therefore in your bodies,

in Rom 12:1,

I beseech you therefore, brethren, . . .
to present your bodies a living
sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God,
which is your spiritual service,

and in the appeal which he raises to his own self-control,

I buffet my body, and bring it into bondage,[1]

Paul warns against all perversions and indulgences of the natural appetites, against moroseness,[2] incest,[3] fornication, and adultery.[4] Here the mystico-ethical formulation of his teaching is remarkably clear. Paul adjoins to these vices not primarily because they are injurious to physical well-being but because they sever the bond which relates believers to Christ. Consequently, his appeal to the church at Corinth to get rid of the immoralous

---

1 I Cor 9:27. 2 Rom 1:26-27. 3 I Cor 5:1-13.

4 I Cor 6:13-20. 5 Rom 8:22; 12:2; I Cor 6:9.

brother is couched in religio-mystical terms: they are urged to keep the feast of the passover ethically,

> not with the old leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.[1]

Paul's teaching on fornication is likewise mystico-ethical in character:

> The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord.[2]
>
> Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot? [3]
>
> But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication.[4]
>
> Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own; . . . glorify God therefore in your body.[5]

This group of expressions constitutes one of the most perfect illustrations of our thesis to be found in Paul's letters. The moral appeal is mystically conditioned. Spiritual relationship to Christ is dependent upon physical cleanliness and self-control. Fornication, homosexuality, incest and adultery are terrible evils because they violate the sacred bond of spiritual relationship with Jesus Christ.

So with all other indulgences of the flesh. Drunkenness

---

1 I Cor 5:7-8. 2 I Cor 6:13. 3 I Cor 6:15.

4 I Cor 6:17. 5 I Cor 6:19-20; cf. I Thes 4:3-8.

Brother is couched in religio-political terms: they are urged to keep the feast of the passover ethically.

> not with the old leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.[1]

Paul's teaching on fornication is likewise mystico-ethical in character:

> The body is not for fornication, but for the Lord.[2]
>
> Know ye not that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I then take away the members of Christ, and make them members of a harlot?[3]
>
> But he that is joined to the Lord is one spirit. Flee fornication.[4]
>
> Or know ye not that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you, which ye have from God? and ye are not your own? . . . Glorify God therefore in your body.[5]

This group of expressions constitutes one of the most perfect illustrations of our thesis to be found in Paul's letters. The moral appeal is mystically conditioned. Spiritual relationship to Christ is dependent upon physical cleanliness and self-control. Fornication, homosexuality, incest and adultery are terrible evils because they violate the sacred bond of spiritual relationship with Jesus Christ.

So with all other behaviorisms of the flesh. Misdemeanors

---

1 I Cor 5:7-8. 2 I Cor 6:13. 3 I Cor 6:15.

4 I Cor 6:17. 5 I Cor 6:19-20; cf. I Thes 4:3-5.

is condemned by Paul not by a discussion of the evils of alcoholism *per se*, but by an appeal to the spiritual life. It is a work of darkness, and is therefore to be shunned, together with all the revelry and dissoluteness to which it gives rise.[1] The man who puts on Christ makes no provision for the flesh. The moral function of the new creature is sobriety.[2]

Thus on every hand Paul deals with the physical self-indulgence of believers by a fierce insistence on the sacredness of the bond which relates believers to Christ. The Christian is ἅγιος, he is called, consecrated, joined to his Lord in one spirit. As such he must separate himself from all that would defile: fornication, uncleanness, and entangling physical attachments of every sort. He must free himself of every relationship which is incompatible with his mystical fellowship with Christ. Paul's ethic of the body and its uses rests not upon an independent moral foundation, but rather emerges from a mystico-ethical relationship with a Person.

2) Stedfastness Closely related to Paul's teaching on physical self-control are his admonitions to *stedfastness*. In the conclusion of I Corinthians Paul says,

> Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong.[3]

Previously he had enjoined them,

---

1 Eph 5:18. Rom 13:12. 2 I Thes 4:10.

3 I Cor 16:13.

is undermined by Paul not by a disregard of the evils of alcoholism per se, but by an appeal to the spiritual life. It is a work of conscience, and is therefore to be commended, together with all the reverence and diligence to which it gives rise.[1] The man who puts on Christ makes no provision for the flesh. The moral function of the new creature is morality.[2]

Thus on every hand Paul deals with the physical self-indulgence of believers by a fierce insistence on the supremacy of the Lord which relates believers to Christ. The Christian is a person, he is sealed, consecrated, joined to his Lord in one spirit. In such he must separate himself from all that would defile: fornication, uncleanness, and entangling physical enjoyments of every sort. He must free himself of every relationship which is incompatible with his spiritual fellowship with Christ. Paul's ethic of the body and its uses rests not upon an independent moral foundation, but rather emerges from a mystico-ethical relationship with a Person.

3) Weatherhead "Christ" related to Paul's teaching on physical self-control are his admonitions to "stedfastness". In the conclusion of I Corinthians Paul says:

Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you
like men, be strong.[3]

Previously he had exhorted them:

---

1 Eph 5:18. Com 13:14. 2 1 Tim 4:10.

3 1 Cor 16:13.

> Be ye stedfast, immovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord. . .[1]

Again and again this appeal to unswerving constancy is echoed in the letters.[2]

It will be noted at once that stedfastness is more than a moral virtue; it is an aspect of the believers' mystico-ethical relationship to Christ. Paul is not counselling fortitude, or endurance, in the strictly ethical sense. He is thinking of stedfastness in faith, holding fast the personal relationship with Christ. His appeal here is born of long experience among new converts. He has seen the line of faith crumble before the attacks of false teachers; he has witnessed the disruption of the saving relationship which his converts established with their Lord through uncleanness, divisions, factions, controversy, and apostasy. He has observed the failure of some to maintain their religious enthusiasm, and of others to keep clear of pagan vices. His ambition is to inject the spirit of loyalty into his wavering people; to render them invincible against the wiles of the devil and the powers and principalities of darkness.[3] Stedfastness thus becomes a cardinal teaching of Paul; the preservation of the mystic tie that joins believers to Christ and to each other in a common fellowship demands unwavering loyalty to the faith.

---

1 I Cor 15:58. 2 Phil 4:1; Gal 5:1; I Cor 1:24.

3 Eph 6:11-12.

> Be ye stedfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord. . .[1]

Again and again this appeal to unwavering consistency is uttered in the letters.[2]

It will be noted at once that stedfastness is more than a moral virtue; it is an aspect of the believers' spiritual-ethical relationship to Christ. Paul is not commending fortitude, or endurance, in the strictly ethical sense. He is thinking of stedfastness in faith, holding fast the personal relationship with Christ. His appeal here is born of long experience among men converts. He has seen the line of faith crumble before the attacks of false teachers; he has witnessed the disruption of the saving relationship which his converts established with their Lord through quarrelsomness, divisions, factions, controversy, and speculation. He has observed the failure of some to maintain their religious enthusiasm, and of others to keep clear of carnal vices. His emphasis is to inject the spirit of loyalty into his wavering people: to render them invincible against the wiles of the devil and the powers and principalities of darkness.[3] Steadfastness thus becomes a spiritual for thing of faith: the preservation of the mystic tie joins believers to Christ and to each other in a common fellowship, demands unwavering loyalty to the faith.

---

1 I Cor 15:58. 2 Phil 4:1; Gal 5:1; I Cor 1:24.

3 Eph 6:11-12.

3) Courage The highest virtues are assumed by Paul to be the normal moral functions of the new creature in Christ Jesus. The man ἐν Χριστῷ is not only stedfast, but courageous. Paul himself sets an enviable example of courage. His conduct, whether under fire in the various communities where he stirred up trouble, on the high seas in the midst of a raging storm, or before the highest potentate of the land, is always courageous. Neither Agrippa nor Festus could frighten him. His boldness, though occasionally impugned by the readers of his letters,[1] is sincere, and his fidelity unyielding. He is not hesitant in speaking of his own good courage,[2] and he enjoins it in others.[3]

He gives us a glimpse of the origin of his courage in I Tim 1:5,

> For God gave us not the spirit of fear, but of power and love and discipline.

Obviously his courage is rooted in his experience of God in Christ. The man in Christ, possessing the power and love of God, cannot be other than courageous.

4) Obedience Truthfulness and Sincerity Other moral functions of the new creature receive minor attention in Paul's letters. His counsel to obedience[4] and praise of its practice[5] is undergirded

---

1 II Cor 10:9-16. 2 II Cor 5:7; 10:1-2.

3 II Cor 5:6 4 I Tim 6:12; Phile verse 21; II Cor 2:9, II Thes 3:4.

5 Phil 2:12; II Cor 7:15.

3) Courage The highest virtues are assumed by Paul to be the normal moral functions of the new creature in Christ Jesus. The man of faith is not only steadfast, but courageous. Paul himself sets an enviable example of courage. His conduct, whether under fire in the various communities where he ministered to trouble, on the high seas in the midst of a raging storm, or before the highest potentate of the land, is always courageous. Neither stripes nor fetters could frighten him. His boldness, though occasionally imagined by the readers of his letters,[1] is sincere, and his fidelity unyielding. He is not hesitant in speaking of his own good courage,[2] and he explains it in others.[3]

He gives us a glimpse of the origin of his courage in I Tim 1:5.

> For God gave us not the spirit of fear, but of power and love and discipline.

Obviously his courage is rooted in his experience of God in Christ. The man in Christ, possessing the power and love of God, cannot be other than courageous.

4) Obedience Other moral functions of the new creature
Trustfulness and Sincerity receive minor attention in Paul's letters. His counsel to obedience[4] and praise of its practice[5] is undergirded

---

1 II Cor 10:9-10. 2 II Cor 5:7; 10:1-2.

3 II Cor 6:6 4 I Tim 6:12; Philo verse 21; II Cor 2:9, II Thes 3:4.

5 Phil 2:12; II Cor 7:15.

by his own example.[1] Paul regards believers as subject at every point to the will of God.[2] Truthfulness and sincerity are the moral traits of the man in Christ.[3] Conscientiousness is essential to the preservation of the Christ-relationship;[4] a good conscience and unfeigned faith go hand in hand.[5] Conscience is a governing force in conduct; for its sake men ought to hold themselves in subjection,[6] and to behave themselves properly.[7] The conscience of others, even where weak or short-sighted, is to be respected.[8] The distinction between good and evil is often emphasized by Paul as the bed-rock of moral integrity.[9] Goodness is one of the "fruits of the Spirit,"[10] and deserves to be followed after.[11] All these virtues, though not specifically formulated in terms of Paul's mystico-ethic, are to be regarded as the

> fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.[12]

Social Morality When we turn to Paul's teaching on social relationships we find an even more clearly defined mystico-ethical formulation than in the teaching on individual morality. Though his original experience of Christ was individual, he sees himself joined to all others in Christ in a great

---

1 Acts 26:19. 2 II Cor 8:5.

3 I Cor 5:7-8; II Cor 6:8; Eph 4:25, 5:4; Col 3:9; I Thes 2:3; I Tim 1:10.

4 I Tim 1:5. 5 I Tim 1:19. 6 Rom 13:5. 7 II Cor 1:12.

8 II Cor 4:2. 9 Rom 12:9; I Cor 15:33; II Cor 13:7.

10 Gal 5:22. 11 I Thes 5:15. 12 Phil 1:14.

by his own example.[1] Paul regards believers as not less at every point to the will of God.[2] Faithfulness and sincerity are the moral traits of the man in Christ.[3] Consideration is essential to the preservation of the Christ-relationship;[4] a good conscience and unfeigned faith go hand in hand.[5] Conscience is a governing force in conduct; for life sake man ought to hold himself in subjection,[6] and to behave himself properly.[7] The conscience of others, even where weak or short-sighted, is to be respected.[8] The distinction between good and evil is often emphasized by Paul as the bed-rock of moral intuition.[9] Love is one of the "fruits of the Spirit,"[10] and deserves to be followed after.[11] All these virtues, though not specifically formulated in terms of Paul's mystico-ethic, are to be regarded as the

> fruits of fellowship, which are through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God.[12]

Social Morality Now we turn to Paul's teaching on social relations; in it we find an even more clearly defined mystico-ethical formulation than in the teaching on individual morality. Though his original experience of Christ was individual, he soon himself joined to all others in Christ in a great

---

1 A:6; 26:19. 2 II Cor 8:6.

3 I Cor 8:7-9; II Cor 4:2; Eph 4:25, 24; Col 3:9; I Thes 2:3
I Tim 1:10.

4 I Tim 1:5. 5 I Tim 1:19. 6 Rom 13:5. 7 II Cor 1:12.

8 II Cor 4:2. 9 Rom 12:2; I Cor 15:56; II Cor 13:7.

10 Gal 5:22. 11 I Thes 5:15. 12 Phil 1:14.

fellowship; he is part of a great organism, the σῶμα Χριστοῦ, every member of which is also in Christ; and in that organism each member is of equal value and significance for the whole. Paul therefore strives to stir every member to conduct himself so as to increase the value and maintain the unity of the whole. Thus Paul's religion is not only a personal experience of God's power, to the creation of a "new creature" within himself; it is also the socialization of a spiritual relationship mystically experienced and morally conditioned, to the creation of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ among all believers.

Mystico-ethical formulation of his social teaching

What we have in Paul is not a code of social ethics, but a mystico-ethical appeal which aims to preserve and enhance the fellowship of those in Christ. This conception of the fellowship, or "body of Christ," is the lever by which Paul seeks to raise the moral life of his churches, just as his conception of "the new creature" is the lever by which he seeks to elevate the moral life of his individual converts. By drawing frequently the attention of his readers to the fact that they are all members of one body, whose head is Christ, he plays upon their deepest aspiration, namely, to be <u>found worthy</u> of membership in that body.[1] He infers that they can be found worthy only as they preserve the <u>unity</u> of the body of Christ. This mystico-ethical formulation is apparent in Phil 1:27-30:

---

1 Eph 4:1.

fellowship is part of a great organism, the κόσμος Χριστοῦ, every member of which is also in Christ; and in that organism each member is of equal value and significance for the whole. Paul therefore strives to stir every member to conduct himself so as to increase the value and enlighten the unity of the whole. Thus Paul's religion is not only a personal experience of God's power, to the creation of a "new creature" within himself; it is also the socialization of a spiritual relationship mystically experienced and morally conditioned, to the creation of the κόσμος Χριστοῦ among all believers.

Mystico-ethical formulation of his social teaching

What we have in Paul is not a code of social ethics, but a mystico-ethical appeal which aims to preserve and enhance the fellowship of those in Christ. This conception of the fellowship, or "body of Christ," is the lever by which Paul seeks to raise the moral life of his churches. Just as his conception of "the new creature" is the lever by which he seeks to elevate the moral life of his individual converts. By drawing frequently the attention of his readers to the fact that they are all members of one body, whose head is Christ, he plays upon their deepest aspiration, namely, to be found working of harmonizing in that body.[1] He infers that they can be found worthy only as they preserve the unity of the body of Christ. This mystico-ethical formulation is apparent in Phil 1:27-2:1:

---

1 Eph 4:1.

> Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you or be absent, I may hear of your state, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel . . . because to you it hath been granted in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf.

Here Paul adds to his ethical appeal the mystical element of participation in the suffering of Christ.

The deft, ingenious way in which Paul both socializes and moralizes this conception of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is revealed in the several passages in which he describes the various functions of Christ's body.[1] Paul's appeal here is not to Christ alone, but to the other members of Christ's body. They have a right to the exercise of their own peculiar functions; they deserve to be treated with the same high ethical regard that is due the Head. The chief thing is to preserve the unity of the body of Christ, and this is possible only by members' having

> the same care one for another.[2]

Disloyalty, unkindness, exploitation of some members at the hands of others, will disrupt the body and cut members off from the Head. Moreover, a sin against any member is a sin against the Head.[3] Thus the

> unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. . .[4]

is the guiding principle of the fellowship. The fellowship is a

---

1 Rom 12:4-8; I Cor 12:4-27; Eph 4:7-12.

2 I Cor 12:25. 3 I Cor 8:12. 4 Eph 4:3.

> Only let your manner of life be worthy of the gospel of Christ: that whether I come and see you or be absent, I may hear of your affairs, that ye stand fast in one spirit, with one soul striving for the faith of the gospel . . . because to you it hath been granted in the behalf of Christ, not only to believe on him, but also to suffer in his behalf.

Here Paul adds to his ethical appeal the mystical element of participation in the sufferings of Christ.

The dark, impalpable way in which Paul both rationalizes and mortalizes this conception of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ is revealed in the several passages in which he describes the various functions of Christ's body.[1] Paul's appeal here is not to Christ alone, but to the other members of Christ's body. They have a right to the exercise of their own peculiar functions; they deserve to be treated with the same high ethical regard that is due the Head. The chief thing is to preserve the unity of the body of Christ, and this is possible only by members' having

> the same care one for another.[2]

Disloyalty, unkindness, exploitation of some members at the hands of others, will disrupt the body and cut members off from the Head. Moreover, a sin against any member is a sin against the Head.[3] From the

> unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. . .

is the guiding principle of the fellowship. The following is a

---

1 Rom 12:4-5; 1 Cor 12:4-27; Eph 4:7-12.

2 1 Cor 12:25. 3 1 Cor 8:12. 4 Eph 4:3.

community of believers joined to the Lord in one faith, one baptism.[1] It is a group of men and women who are ἅγιοι, set apart; each member possesses a common secret, is motivated by a common inner spirit, and participates in a great and eternal common destiny. At all costs this fellowship must be maintained, purified, strengthened. The preservation of its integrity becomes the motive for the conduct of all. The virtues to be practiced are such as will promote the welfare of the whole group and the wellbeing of each member.[2]

So Paul invokes the common virtues of social morality by the authority of a mystico-ethical sanction. Truth-speaking is good and falsehood is bad because

> We are members one of another.[3]

Stealing is wrong because it harms the member who steals as well as the victim of the theft,

> . . . rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good.[4]

Corrupt speech is evil because it does not edify the fellowship.[5] Every moral act which weakens the bond of fellowship Paul frowns upon, and every act which strengthens that bond he encourages. All things are to be done toward edifying the whole group,[6] to-

---

1 Eph 4:4. 2 Eph 4:2; Col 3:12-14.

3 Eph 4:25, cf. 4:15. 4 Eph 4:28. 5 Eph 4:29, cf. Rom 14:9.

6 I Cor 14:26.

community of believers joined to the Lord in one faith, one baptism.[1] It is a group of men and women who are [illegible] each other; each member possesses a common secret, is motivated by a common inner spirit, and participates in a great and eternal common destiny. At all costs this fellowship must be maintained, purified, strengthened. The preservation of the integrity because the motive for the conduct of all. The virtues to be practiced are such as will promote the welfare of the whole group and the edification of each member.[2]

So Paul invokes the common virtues of social morality by the authority of a apostolic-ethical exhortation. Truth-speaking is good and falsehood is bad because

we are members one of another.[3]

Stealing is wrong because it harms the member who steals as well as the victim of the theft.

. . . rather let him labor, working with his hands the thing that is good.[4]

Corrupt speech is evil because it does not edify the fellowship.[5] Every moral act which weakens the bond of fellowship "pains God" upon, and every act which strengthens that bond is encouraged. All things are to be done to and edifying the whole group,[6] be-

---

1 Eph 4:4. 2 Eph 4:5; Col 3:12-14.

3 Eph 4:25, cf. 4:15. 4 Eph 4:28. 5 Eph 4:29, cf. Rom 14:19.

6 I Cor 14:26.

ward building up each member,[1] and the body as a whole.[2]

Love - the impulse of the new fellowship

The mystico-ethical bond of the new fellowship is love. Paul's own experience of the love of God in Christ Jesus is extended to include all those who, like himself, are in fellowship with Christ. Love not only binds men to Christ; it binds them to each other. The whole experience of being in the fellowship is an experience of love. The mystical relationship of believers to Christ and to each other can exist and find expression only in love.

Paul's use of ἀγάπη

The noun ἀγάπη, unlike the verb ἀγαπάω, is seldom found in Classical Greek or the LXX. But in the New Testament it is frequently used, and in early Christian writers its use becomes habitual and general.

> Nothing could show more clearly that a new principle has been created than this creation of a new word.[3]

The meanings of the two words φιλέω and ἀγαπάω have this difference: the former in general emphasizes the natural spontaneous affection of one person for another, while αγαπάω refers rather to love into which there enters an element of choice, and hence of moral character. ἀγαπάω is rarely used of sexual love. φιλέω

---

1 I Thes 5:11. 2 Eph 4:16; II Cor 10:8; 13:10.

3 Sanday, "Romans," (I C C) p. 375.

word building up each member,[1] and the body as a whole.[2]

Love - the impulse of the new fellowship

The mystico-spiritual bond of the new fellowship is love. Paul's own experience of the love of God in Christ Jesus is extended to include all those who, like himself, are in fellowship with Christ. Love not only binds man to Christ; it binds them to each other. The whole experience of being in the fellowship is an experience of love. The spiritual relationship of believers to Christ and to each other can exist and find expression only in love.

Paul's use of ἀγάπη

The noun ἀγάπη, unlike the verb ἀγαπάω, is neither found in classical Greek or the LXX. But in the New Testament it is frequently used, and in early Christian writers its use becomes habitual and general.

> Nothing could show more clearly that a new principle has been created than this creation of a new word.[3]

The meaning of the two words φιλέω and ἀγαπάω have this difference: the former in general emphasizes the natural spontaneous affection of one person for another, while ἀγαπάω refers rather to love into which there enters an element of choice, and hence of moral character. ἀγάπη is rarely used of sexual love. φιλέω

---

1 I Thes 5:11. 2 Eph 4:16; II Cor 10:5; Lord.

3 Findlay, "Romans," (E G T) p. 372.

is never used in the command to men to love God or men, and very rarely of God's love to men. Either term may be used of honorable love between man and man, into which there enters more or less of the element of choice and decision.

> ἀγάπη is used chiefly of love between the sexes in the LXX, but in Wisdom and in Philo of the love of God and the love of wisdom. This sense becomes the prevailing one in the New Testament, wholly displacing the use with reference to love between the sexes. Nor are there any clear instances of ἀγάπη in reference to ordinary human friendship, personal affection. The desire to possess is also rarely present as a prominent element. On the other hand ἀγάπη is used freely of God's approving attitude towards Jesus (John 15:10; 17:26); of the love of God and of Christ towards men, even sinful men (Rom 5:5,8; 8:35, 39; I Jn 3:1, 16; 4:9, 10, 16); of the love which men are bidden to have for God (Lk 11:42; Jn 5:42; I Jn 2:5, 15; 4:18; 5:3; the only clear example in the Pauline epistles is II Thes 3:5); and with especial frequency in Paul of the love which men have, or are enjoined to have, towards one another (Jn 15:13; Rom 12:9; 13:10; 14:15; I Cor 13:1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 13; 14:1).[1]

These various usages of the word are not mutually exclusive; more than one may appear in a single use. Of the use of ἀγαπήσεις in Gal 5:14 Burton says:

> The verb in this passage and the noun in all the instances occurring in this epistle (5:6, 13, 22) while including the element of appreciation, recognition of worth, which is fundamental to all the meanings of both verb and noun, evidently lay chief stress upon the desire and will to benefit, which issues in efforts for the wellbeing of another. . . It is love of this type, of which recognition of worth is the foundation, and desire to benefit

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), p. 521, (underscoring mine).

is never used in the command to man to love God or man, and very rarely of God's love to man. Another term may be used of human love between man and man, into which there enters more or less of the element of choice and decision.

> ἀγάπη is used chiefly of love between the sexes in the LXX, but in Wisdom and in Philo of the love of God and the love of wisdom. This sense becomes the prevailing one in the New Testament, wholly displacing the non-moral reference to love between the sexes. Nor are there any clear instances of ἀγάπη in reference to ordinary human friendship, personal affection. The desire to possess is also rarely present as a prominent element. On the other hand ἀγάπη is used freely of God's approving attitude towards Jesus (John 15:10; IV:23); of the love of God and of Christ towards men, even sinful men (Rom 5:5,8; 8:35, 39; I Jn 3:1, 16; 4:9, 10, 16); of the love which men are bidden to have for God (Mk 12:42; Jn 5:42; I Jn 2:5, 15; 4:16; 5:3; the only clear example in the Pauline epistles is II Thess 3:5); and with no social reference in Paul of the love which men have, or are enjoined to have, towards one another (Jn 13:35; 15:10; 15:13; I Cor 16:1, 2, 5, 14, 8, 13; 14:1).[1]

Three various usages of the word are not usually coordinated; more than one may appear in a single use. Of the use of ἀγαπάω in Col 3:14 Burton says:

> The verb in this passage and the noun in all the instances occurring in this epistle (3:8, 14, 22) while including the element of affectionate recognition of worth, which is fundamental to all the meanings of both verb and noun, evidently lay other stress upon the decision and will to bestow, which issues in activity for the welfare of another. . . . It is love of this type, of which recognition of worth is the foundation, and desire to benefit

---

1 Burton, "Galatians," (I.C.C.), p. 531. (made according alone).

> the leading element, that Paul exalts in his remarkable panegyric in I Cor Chap. 13, and of which he says in Rom 13:10 that love is the fulfilment of the law, and in Gal 5:6: 'In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love.'[1]

Sanday and Headlam[2] note three characteristics of Christian love:

> 1) The new Christian doctrine of love is universal. . .
> 2) The Christian doctrine of love was the substitution of a universal principle for law. All moral precepts are summed up in the one command of love. Love is a principle and a passion, and as such is the fulfilment of the Law.
> 3) How is this new Christian spirit possible? It is possible because it is intimately bound up with that love which is a characteristic of the Godhead. . . It is possible also because men have learnt to love mankind in Christ.
>
> These three points will help to elucidate what St. Paul means by ἀγάπη . It is in fact the correlative in the moral world to what faith is in the religious life. Like faith it is universal; like faith it is a principle not a code; like faith it is centered in the Godhead. Hence St. Paul as St. John (I Jn 3:23) sums up Christianity in Faith and Love, which are finally united in that Love of God, which is the end and root of both.

From this discussion of ἀγάπη in Paul's letters the following conclusions concerning his uses of the word may be drawn:

1) Love is the moral counterpart of faith;[3] it is not an ethical virtue in the strict sense, but a

---

1 Op. cit., p. 521, (underscoring mine).

2 "Romans," (I C C) p. 377.

3 Gal 5:6; Col 1:4; I Thes 1:3.

the leading element, that and evaluate in his remarkable passages in I Cor Chap. 13, and of which he says in Jon 15:10 that love is the fulfillment of the law, and in Gal 5:6: "In Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love."[1]

Sandy and Headlam[2] note three characteristics of Christian love:

> 1) The new revelation teaching of love is universal. . .
>
> 2) The Christian doctrine of love was the substitution of a universal principle for law. All moral precepts are summed up in the one command of love. Love is a principle and a passion, and as such is the fulfillment of the law.
>
> 3) How is this new Christian spirit possible? It is possible because it is intimately bound up with that love which is a characteristic of the Godhead. . . It is possible also because men have learnt to love mankind in Christ.

These three points will help to elucidate what St. Paul means by Agape. It is in fact the correlative in the moral world to what faith is in the religious life. Like faith it is universal; like faith it is a principle not a code; like faith it is centered in the Godhead. Here too, and as St. John (I Jn 3:23) sums up Christianity in Faith and Love, which are finally united in that love of God, which is the end and root of both.

From this discussion of Agape in Paulin letters the following conclusions concerning his use of the word may be drawn:

1) Love is the moral counterpart of faith; it is not an ethical virtue in the Greek sense, but a

---

1 Op. cit., p. 321, (underscoring mine).

2 "Romans," (I C C) p. 57f. 3 Gal 5:6; Col 1:4; I Tim 1:5.

religious attitude born of mystic fellowship with God in Christ.

2) Love is the impulse and bond of the new fellowship; on the one hand it is creative power by which believers promote the welfare of each other, and on the other, it is the unitive mystico-ethical principle which knits believers into the body of Christ.[1]

3) Love is the fulfilment of the law, and becomes the fit substitute for moral legalism.[2]

4) Through love the believer partakes of the fundamental character of God (and Christ).[3]

5) Love is the all-embracing social virtue of the members of the body of Christ, the matrix from which all other virtues spring.

Brotherly love — The word φιλαδελφία occurs but twice in the letters of Paul,[4] and only two or three times elsewhere in the New Testament. Yet the moral attitude it represents must be reckoned one of the distinctive aspects of Paul's social teaching. It represents the mutual love which members of the Christian fellowship bear one another. Thayer[5] translates it to mean the kind of love which is implicit in family relationships, as

---

1 I Cor 13. 2 Gal 5:14. 3 Eph 3:17-19.

4 Rom 12:10; I Thes 4:9.

5 Greek-English Lexicon of the N.T., ad loc.

religious attitude born of mystic fellowship with God in Christ.

2) Love is the impulse and bond of the new fellowship; on the one hand it is creative power by which believers promote the welfare of each other, and on the other, it is the unitive mystico-ethical principle which knits believers into the body of Christ.[1]

3) Love is the fulfillment of the law, and becomes the fit substitute for moral legalism.[2]

4) Through love the believer partakes of the transcendental character of God (and Christ).[3]

5) Love is the all-encircling social virtue of the members of the body of Christ, the matrix from which all other virtues spring.

Brotherly love The word φιλαδελφία occurs but twice in the letters of St. P., and only two or three times elsewhere in the New Testament. Yet the moral attitude it represents must be reckoned one of the distinctive aspects of Pauli social teaching. It represents the mutual love which members of the Christian fellowship bear one another. Trench translates it to mean the kind of love which is implicit in family relationships, as

---

1 I Cor 12. 2 Gal 5:14. 3 Eph 3:17-19.

4 Rom 12:10; I Thes 4:9.

5 Cross-Knight Decision of the C.C., no 100.

in the love of a parent for a child, or the love of husband for wife, or brothers for each other. Now Paul uses ἀγάπη frequently as though this more intimate meaning (of φιλαδελφία) were in his mind.[1] It is this tender affection for every other member of the body of Christ that Paul delights to exalt. Out of brotherly love grow all other social attitudes which aid in the building up of the body of Christ; these are, specifically: a) Regard for the welfare of others; b) Forgiveness, and returning good for evil; c) Forbearance; d) Edification. It will be observed that each of these represents a peculiar formulation of ethical principle. The standard of ethical action involved in each is the attainment of a perfect fellowship, a fellowship mystically conceived, in which the personal relationships of members to Christ and to each other are of paramount importance. Here again Paul implements mysticism with morality by declaring that the body of Christ can only be held intact by the exercise of regard for the welfare of others, forgiveness, forbearance, and edification. We shall now examine more closely these functions or aspects of ἀγάπη.

Regard for the welfare of others.

The spirit of the Sermon on the Mount is echoed repeatedly in the social teachings of Paul. Just as Jesus taught that the Kingdom of God is realized in promoting the good of others, so Paul teaches that the

---

1 Rom 13:9; 14:15; I Cor 13:1 f.; II Cor 6:6; Gal 5:13, 22; Phil 2:1, 2; Col 1:4,8; 2:2; 3:14; I Thes 1:3; 3:12; 4:9 f.; 5:13; II Thes 1:3; I Tim 1:5.

in the love of a parent for a child, or the love of husband for wife, or brothers for each other. Now Paul uses agape frequently as though this more intimate meaning of agape were in his mind.[1] It is this tender affection for every other member of the body of Christ that Paul delights to extol. Out of brotherly love grew all other social attitudes which all in the building up of the body of Christ; these are, specifically: a) Regard for the welfare of others; b) Forgiveness, and returning good for evil; c) Forbearance; d) Humiliation. It will be observed that each of these represents a <u>reaching for relation of ethical principle</u>. The standard of ethical action involved in each is the <u>attainment of a perfect relationship</u>, a relationship spiritually conceived, in which the personal relationships of members to Christ and to each other are of paramount importance. Here again Paul implements agapeism with morality by declaring that the body of Christ can only be held intact by the exercise of regard for the welfare of others, forgiveness, forbearance, and humiliation. We shall now examine more closely these functions or aspects of agape.

Regard for the welfare of others. The spirit of the Saviour on the Mount is colored respectfully in the social possibilities of God. Just as Jesus taught that the kingdom of God is realized in providing the good of others, so Paul teaches that the

---

1 Rom 1:29; 14:15; 1 Cor 13:1 f., 11 Cor 6:6; Gal 5:13, 22; Phil 2:1, 2; Col 1:4, 5; 3:14; 2 Tim 1:3; 3:12; 4:9 f.; Philm 1:7 Tim 1:5; 1 Tim 1:5.

obvious implication of being a member of the body of Christ is a brotherly regard for the welfare of others. True, Paul's teaching is more restricted than that of Jesus; Paul thinks primarily in terms of the Christian fellowship. Within the limits of that fellowship he applies what Jesus universalized. Paul's attitude is clearly expressed in Galatians:

> Let us work that which is good toward all men, and especially toward them that are of the household of faith.[1]

Within the bounds of the "household of faith" his teaching is explicit:

> Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbor's good.[2]
>
> Exhort one another, and build each other up, even as also ye do.[3]
>
> Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ.[4]
>
> Through love be servants one to another.[5]
>
> In love be tenderly affectioned one to another, in honor preferring one another.[6]

A justifiable ground for sending Timothy to the Philippians is that he will care truly for their state,[7] while others whom he might send

> seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ.[8]

---

1 Gal 6:10. 2 I Cor 10:24, cf. Phil 3:4, I Thes 5:15.

3 I Thes 5:11. 4 Gal 6:2, cf. Rom 15:1. 5 Gal 5:13.

6 Rom 12:10. 7 Phil 2:19-20. 8 Phil 2:21.

obvious implication of being a member of the body of Christ is a

<u>moral concern for the welfare of others</u>. Thus, Paul's teach-

ing is more restricted than that of Jesus; Paul thinks primarily

in terms of the Christian fellowship. Within the limits of that

fellowship he applies what Jesus universalized. Paul's attitude

is clearly expressed in Galatians:

> Let us work that which is good toward all men,
> and especially toward them that are of the
> household of faith.[1]

Within the bounds of the "household of faith" his teaching is

explicit:

> Let no man seek his own, but each his neighbor's
> good.[2]
>
> Submit one another, and build each other up,
> even as also ye do.[3]
>
> Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill
> the law of Christ.[4]
>
> Through love be servants one to another.[5]
>
> In love be tenderly affectioned one to another,
> in honor preferring one another.[6]

A justifiable ground for reading Christ's to the Philippians is that

he will care truly for their state,[7] while others whom he might send

seek their own, not the things of Jesus Christ.[8]

---

1 Gal 6:10. 2 1 Cor 10:24, cf. Phil 2:4, 1 Thes 5:15.

3 1 Thes 5:11. 4 Gal 6:2, cf. Rom 15:1. 5 Gal 5:13.

6 Rom 12:10. 7 Phil 2:19-20. 8 Phil 2:21.

Paul has conducted himself with due regard for the welfare of others. He has renounced privileges which he might justifiably have claimed solely in order to be of greater service.[1] He seeks not his own profit, but the profit of many.[2] He and his co-workers took care never to wrong, nor corrupt, nor take advantage of any members of the body of Christ.[3] He seeks not the possessions of his converts, but their souls,[4] and will willingly spend himself for them.[5] On the basis of such self-giving, he feels no compunction in writing to the Thessalonians:

> The Lord make you to increase and abound in love toward one another, and toward all men, even as we also do toward you.[6]

Thus the fellowship of the body of Christ is to be maintained by love which promotes the welfare of each and all members. Through mystical fellowship with Christ, whose spirit of love becomes power in the lives of those who are in intimate relationship with him, this exercise of due regard for others becomes possible.

Forgiveness and Returning Good for Evil

The spirit of love Paul holds to operate through forgiveness and returning good for evil. Here again Paul's teaching reproduces the ethics of Jesus. Jesus' teaching on <u>forgiveness</u> is paralleled by Paul's teaching in II Cor 2:5-10, where he counsels the readers to

---

1 I Cor 9:1-23; I Thes 2:9.

2 I Cor 10:33.

3 II Cor 7:2; 12:17-18.

4 II Cor 12:14.

5 II Cor 12:15.

6 I Thes 3:12.

Paul has conducted himself with due regard for the welfare of others. He has renounced privileges which he might justifiably have claimed solely in order to be of greater service.[1] He seeks not his own profit, but the profit of many.[2] He and his co-workers took care never to wrong, nor corrupt, nor take advantage of any members of the body of Christ.[3] He seeks not the possessions of his converts, but their souls,[4] and will willingly spend himself for them.[5] On the basis of such self-giving, he feels no compunction in writing to the Thessalonians:

> The Lord make you to increase and abound in
> love toward one another, and toward all men,
> even as we also do toward you.[6]

Thus the relationship of the body of Christ is to be maintained by love which produces the welfare of each and all members. Through spiritual fellowship with Christ, whose spirit of love becomes power in the lives of those who are in intimate relationship with him, this exercise of due regard for others becomes possible.

Forgiveness and Returning Good for Evil — The spirit of love Paul calls to operate through forgiveness and returning good for evil. Here again Paul's teaching reproduces the ethics of Jesus. Jesus' teaching on forgiveness is paralleled by Paul's teaching in II Cor 2:5-10, where he counsels the readers to

---

1 I Cor 9:1-23; I Thes 2:8. 2 I Cor 10:33.

3 II Cor 7:2; 12:17-18. 4 II Cor 12:14.

5 II Cor 11:28. 6 I Thes 3:12.

forgive the offender; in Gal 6:1, where the readers are urged to restore the trespasser in gentleness; in Eph 4:32, where forgiveness, kindness, and tenderheartedness are recommended; and in Col 3:12, where converts are exhorted to "put on" forgiveness.

Jesus' teaching on love of enemies,[1] returning good for evil,[2] anger,[3] vengeance, persecution, etc., is approximated by Paul in numerous passages.[4]

Paul's mainspring of ethical action in all these matters is the Christ-relationship. The context of the passage cited from I Cor 4 reveals Paul's chief concern to be that of the believers' relation to Christ. The strong admonitions in Rom 12 belong to a passage which exalts the body of Christ. The functions of the members of the body of Christ[5] are to be exercised in the spirit of non-resistance, of returning good for evil, and of "second mile" conduct. These attitudes are essential to the maintenance of the fellowship of the newborn. They are aspects of that brotherly love which is the "bond of perfectness." This chapter in Romans serves therefore as a clear example of one important point: Paul's standard of ethical action is the creation and preservation of a perfect fellowship. These social attitudes are important to Paul not primar-

---

1 Mt 5:43 f. 2 Mt. 5:38 f. 3 Mt 5:21 f.

4 Rom 12:14, 17, 19, 20, 21; I Cor 4:12-13; II Thes 3:14-15.

5 Rom 12:6-8.

forgive the offender; in Gal 6:1, where the readers are urged to restore the transgressor in gentleness; in Eph 4:32, where forgiveness, kindness, and tenderheartedness are recommended; and in Gal 5:15, where converts are exhorted to "put out forgiveness."

Jesus' teaching on love of enemies,[1] returning good for evil,[2] anger,[3] vengeance, persecution, etc., is summarized by Paul in numerous passages.[4]

Paul's mainspring of ethical action in all these matters is the Christ-relationship. The context of the passage cited from I Cor 4 reveals to the chief concern to be that of the believers' relation to Christ. The strong admonitions in Rom 12 belong to a passage which crits the body of Christ. The admonitions of the members of the body of Christ are to be exercised in the spirit of non-retaliation, of returning good for evil, and of "beyond allow" conduct. These attitudes are essential to the maintenance of the fellowship of the members. They are aspects of that "holiday love which is the bond of perfectness." This chapter in Romans serves therefore as a clear example of one important point: Paul's standard of ethical action is the creation and preservation of a perfect fellowship. These social attitudes are important to Paul not primar-

---

1 Mt 5:43 f. 2 Rom. 5:8 f. 3 Mt 5:21 f.

4 Rom 12:14, 17, 19, 20, 21; I Cor 4:12-13; II Thes 3:14-15.

5 Rom 12:9-8.

ily because of their intrinsic worth, but because through them the body of Christ is built up.

Forbearance In Paul's teaching on forbearance we have one of the most interesting examples of the formulation of his moral teaching in terms of his mystico-ethic. We saw in our study of Paul's attitude toward the law that freedom is one of the cardinal points of his teaching. The old legalistic system of Judaism could have for the "new creature" no force, or power. Satisfactory relationship to God comes not through works of the law but through personal relationship with Jesus Christ. The "new creature" is a free man.

But Paul's freedom was not merely from Jewish legalism, but from legalism of every sort. Gentiles as well as Jews he conceives to have been victims of law. When therefore he says

> God sent forth his Son that he might
> redeem them that are under (the) law,
> that we might receive the adoption of sons,[1]

he includes both Jews and Gentiles.[2] The religious system of the Gentiles was also impotent because legalistic. So he desires to free them from their legalism also.

---

1 Gal 4:4-5.

2 For νόμον is here used not with the article, in the narrow sense of the Law of Moses, but without the article, as indicating any who are living under a system of legalism. The law of the Gentiles written in the heart, might be externalized and rendered legalistic. Cf. I Cor 9:20. Burton, "Galatians," (I C C), p. 219.

ily because of their intrinsic worth, but because through them the body or church is built up.

For reference In Paul's teaching on forbearance we have one of the most interesting examples of the formulation of his moral teaching in terms of the spiritual-ethic. We may in our study of Paul's attitude toward the law take freedom is one of the central points of his teaching. The old legalistic system of Judaism could have for the "new creature" no force, or power. Satisfactory relationship to God came not through works of the law but through personal relationship with Jesus Christ. The "new creature" is a free man.

But Paul's freedom was not merely from Jewish legalism, but from legalism of every sort. Gentiles as well as Jews had to conceive to have been victims of law. Man therefore is says

> God sent forth His Son that he might
> redeem them that are under (the) law,
> that we might receive the adoption of sons.[1]

He includes both Jews and Gentiles. The religious system of the Gentiles was also important because legalistic. So he desires to free them from their legalism also.

---

1 Gal 4:4-5.

2 For "slave" is here used not with the article, in the sense of the law of Moses, but without the article, as indicating only the are living under a system of legalism. The law of the spiritual written in the heart, might be contrasted and therefore legalistic.

3. 1 Cor 9:20. Peake, "Galatians" (L.C.C), p. 210.

> Now that ye have come to know God, or rather to be known by God, how turn ye back again to the weak and beggarly rudiments, whereunto ye desire to be in bondage over again? Ye observe days, and months, and seasons, and years.[1]

These things, says Paul, belong to an ineffectual and poverty-stricken religious system which is without power. Both heathenism and the so-called "rudiments" to which the Galatians were turning were legalistic in character. Acceptance with God is no more possible through the legalism of "rudiments" than through the legalism of the law of Moses. This exhortation to freedom from Gentile legalism is echoed in Col 2:20-22, where the readers are encouraged to free themselves from "rudiments" and "ordinances." Thus in both these passages Paul pleads for the same freedom for the Gentiles that he seeks for the Jews. His position is one of complete separation from legalism. With climactic power he sums up his argument against all legalism:

> For freedom did Christ set us free: stand fast, therefore, and be not entangled again in the yoke of bondage.[2]

> For the Lord is the Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty.[3]

This charter of moral freedom we hold to be derived directly from Paul's mystico-ethical relationship with Christ. The "new creature" appropriates the effective redemption wrought by Christ through a faith-fellowship with him. Freedom is the inevitable consequence of the new creation.

---

1 Gal 4:9-10. 2 Gal 5:1. 3 II Cor 3:17.

But the social formulation of Paul's mysticism, though involving no absolute contradiction to his individual experience and teaching, raised for Paul a very difficult and significant problem. The believer is not only a "new creature," he is an integral factor in the "new fellowship," a member of the "body of Christ." Of freedom he has no end. No old ties can bind him. But there is a new tie which he must take into account. In fellowship, a social relationship with others, his individual freedom is limited by consideration of the welfare of the whole group. Just as the controlling ethical principle of the new creature is freedom, so the controlling principle of the new fellowship is love. And in the daily life of the Christian community, where the individual is compelled to adjust himself to and contribute to the welfare of the total group, these two vibrant principles come into collision. Because both forces are creative, their meeting need not be fraught with disaster; indeed it may lead to the creation of higher values. Paul assumes that freedom and love complement each other. In practice Paul exhorts men to exercise both individual freedom and brotherly love, - to maintain their liberty, yet have regard for the welfare of others. Out of this interpenetration of love and freedom is born Paul's doctrine of forbearance.

Paul's teaching on forbearance is summed up in Gal 5:13:

> For ye brethren, were called for freedom; only use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh, but through love be servants one to another.

This verse not only sums up all that Paul has been saying in the letter

concerning freedom, but turns to the related problem of the danger of abusing freedom. Up to this point in the letter he has defended the Gentiles' freedom from the statutes of the law, and from law as a whole. Naturally, to men who regarded the law as the only restraint on self-indulgence, or to those who never had been subject to higher ethical standards, Paul's declaration of freedom might appear as a gateway to unrestrained gratification of the natural impulses. That Paul was aware of this danger is shown by Rom 6:1 ff., Phil 3:17 ff., Col 3:1 ff. So in Gal 5:13 he tackles it directly:

> Use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh.

He throws over against such misuse of freedom the whole force of his love-ethic:

> but through love be servants one to another.

Thus in the most ingenious yet practical way the apostle checks one great mystico-ethical principle with another. The well-being of the group, promoted by love expressing itself in mutual service, is paramount, and dare not be violated by any abuse of freedom. Paul does not here make his doctrine of freedom of no effect, for true freedom is consonant with love. Only an abuse of freedom can break the bond of fellowship.

Paul's teaching on forbearance, bred of this interaction of freedom and love, finds another striking illustration in I Cor 8-10.

assuming freedom, but turns to the related problem of the danger of abusing freedom. Up to this point in the letter he has confuted the Gentiles' freedom from the authority of the law, and from law as a whole. Naturally, to men who regarded the law as the only authority on all-important, or to those who never had been subject to higher ethical standards, Paul's declamation of freedom will appear as a pathway to unrestricted gratification of the natural impulses. This fact was aware of this danger is shown by Gal 5:1 ff., Phil 3:17 ff., Col 3:1 ff. So in Gal 5:13 he tackles it directly:

> Use not your freedom for an occasion to the flesh.

He throws over against such abuse of freedom the whole force of his love-ethics:

> But through love be servants one to another.

Thus in the most impassione yet practical way the apostle stands one great mystico-ethical principle with another. The well-being of the group, promoted by love expressing itself in mutual service, is paramount, and dare not be violated by any abuse of freedom. Paul does not thus make his doctrine of freedom of no effect, for true freedom is consonant with love. Only an abuse of freedom can break the bond of fellowship.

Paul's speaking on forbearance, bred of this interaction of freedom and love, finds another striking illustration in I Cor 8-10.

Evidently a group of Corinthian Christians were following Paul's injunctions to freedom with a vengeance. They arrogated to themselves the title of πνευματικοί, and considered themselves above all law. They distorted Paul's teaching on freedom to mean license. Paul deals with them on one burning issue precipitated by their excess of freedom, - the eating of idol-meat. So far as his attitude toward idol-meat is concerned, Paul is clear and consistent.

> Concerning therefore the eating of things sacrificed to idols, we know that no idol is anything in the world, and that there is no God but one.[1]

> Food will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better.[2]

What Christians eat is therefore a matter of indifference. From all laws concerning food he conceived Christians to be free. He never relinquished this position.

But the matter was complicated by the weak conscience of other members of the Church at Corinth who experienced a strong reaction against the eating of meat sacrificed to idols. These believers were members of the new fellowship, but had not yet succeeded in ridding themselves of deep-seated inhibitions on the matter of eating meat which had been consecrated in pagan temples. Therefore when the more liberal πνευματικοί ate freely of the idol-meat,

---

1 I Cor 8:4. 2 I Cor 8:8.

Evidently a group of Corinthian Christians were following Paul's injunctions to freedom with a vengeance. They arrogated to themselves the title of "Pneumatikoi", and considered themselves above all law. They distributed fully tenfold on freedom to mean license. Paul deals with this one-sided teaching issue precipitated by their excess of freedom, - the eating of idol-meat. So far as his attitude toward idol-meat is concerned, Paul is clear and vociferous.

> Concerning therefore the eating of things sacrificed to idols, we know that no idol is anything in the world, and there is no God but one.[1]

> Food will not commend us to God: neither, if we eat not, are we the worse; nor, if we eat, are we the better.[2]

What Christians eat is therefore a matter of indifference. From all laws concerning food he conceives Christians to be free. He never relinquished this position.

But the matter was complicated by the weak conscience of other members of the Church at Corinth who experienced a strong reaction against the eating of meat sacrificed to idols. These liberal-more members of the new following, but had not yet succeeded in ridding themselves of deep-seated inhibitions on the matter of eating meat which had been consecrated in pagan temples. Therefore when the more liberal "Pneumatikoi" ate freely of the idol-meat,

---

1. 1 Cor 8:4. 2. 1 Cor 8:8.

bought at the markets after having served its official purpose in the heathen temples, the brethren of weak conscience were both troubled and offended.

To solve this difficult problem in Christian relationships Paul appeals to forbearance. He urges the πνευματικοί to have regard for the weak conscience of their more limited brethren. His method is most skillful. Ironically he appeals to their boasted knowledge, and inquires, in effect, whether such superior knowledge justifies the violation of another's conscience. Not only does the assumption of such superiority tend to arrogance, but it may contribute to the actual downfall of the weak brethren; for if the latter, to whom the eating of idol-meat is sinful, see the more liberal Christians eating, they may be tempted to do the same, and in their case such conduct would be fatal to their faith.[1] If such a disastrous thing came to pass, the liberal brethren would be committing a sin against Christ.[2] For to encourage a man to violate his own conscience, however weak, is actually to destroy a brother for whom Christ died.[3]

The only solution to such a problem lies in the application of the spirit of love. The body of Christ, of which the weak as well as the strong brethren are members, demands tolerance and

---

1 I Cor 8:10-11. 2 I Cor 8:12. 3 I Cor 8:13.

brought at the instance after having served the initial purpose in the Christian temples, the burden of weak conscience were both troubled and offended.

To solve this difficult problem in Christian relationships Paul appeals to tolerance. He urges the "strong" to have regard for the weak conscience of their more limited brethren. His method is most skillful. Ironically he appeals to their boasted knowledge, and inquires, in effect, whether such superior knowledge justifies the violation of another's conscience. Not only does the assumption of such superiority tend to arrogance, but it may contribute to the actual downfall of the weak brethren; for if the leaders, to whom the coming of idol-meats is sinful, see the more liberal Christians eating, they may be tempted to do the same, and in their case such conduct would be fatal to their faith.[1] If such a disaster is likely once to pass, the liberal brethren would be committing a sin against Christ.[2] For to encourage a man to violate his own conscience, however weak, is actually to destroy a brother for whom Christ died.[3]

The only solution to such a problem lies in the application of the spirit of love. The body of Christ, of which the weak as well as the strong brethren are members, demands tolerance and

---

1 I Cor 8:10-11. 2 I Cor 8:12. 3 I Cor 8:13.

forbearance. It is more important that the fellowship be kept intact than that the more enlightened give full expression to their freedom. So far as Paul himself is concerned, his mind is clear: meat is no problem for him; he is free from all laws of uncleanness. Nevertheless he will act in love and consideration for his weaker brethren.

> Therefore, if meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, that I cause not my brother to stumble.[1]

In I Cor 9:1-27 Paul appeals to his own example of forbearance in support of his appeal to others. He enjoyed certain rights and privileges, such as eating, drinking, marrying, and receiving support for his labors. But he never claimed them.[2] So the πνευματικοί ought also to do, forgetting their superior degree of enlightenment, and ceasing from their declarations of freedom. If Paul is willing to forego his privileges, and subject himself to the bondage of his brethren, becoming all things to all men,[3] they ought to do likewise.

Their freedom, Paul insists, is unimpaired. They may buy at the shambles meat which has been consecrated to idols; they may attend a feast, and eat what is set before them without conscientious scruple.[4] But if knowledge of the fact that the meat on the table had been sacrificed to idols is pointedly introduced by

---

1 I Cor 8:13.

2 I Cor 9:12.

3 I Cor 9:22.

4 I Cor 10:25f.

forbearance. It is more important that the fellowship be kept intact than that the more enlightened give full expression to their freedom. So far as Paul himself is concerned, his mind is clear: meat is no problem for him; he is free from all love of uncleanness. Nevertheless he will not in love not consider-ation for his weaker brethren.

> Therefore, if meat causeth my brother to stumble, I will eat no flesh for evermore, lest I cause not my brother to stumble.[1]

In I Cor 9:1-27 Paul appeals to his own example of forbearance in support of his appeal to others. He employed certain rights and privileges, such as eating, drinking, marrying, and receiving support for his labors. But he never claimed them.[2] So the "weaker brother" ought also to do. Forgetting their superior degree of enlightenment, and ceasing from their declarations of freedom. If Paul is willing to forego his privileges, and subject himself to the bondage of his brethren, becoming all things to all men,[3] they ought to do likewise.

Their freedom, Paul insists, is undigested. They say by at the examples meat which has been consecrated to idols: they say without a fault, and eat what is set before them without conscientious scruple.[4] But if knowledge of the fact that the meat on the table had been sacrificed to idols is painfully introduced by

---

1 I Cor 8:13. 2 I Cor 9:12.

3 I Cor 9:22. 4 I Cor 10:25f.

any member present, the Christian will do well to refrain from eating, lest he prejudice an unbeliever, or violate the weak conscience of a brother. Against this background Paul's teaching on forbearance becomes entirely intelligible.[1]

The same spirit of forbearance is advocated in Rom 14:1 - 15:13. Although the meat-eating problem here is not complicated by idol-consecration, the same spirit of forbearance is invoked. Paul insists that all things are clean,[2] but that "it is evil for that man who eateth with offence." Whether of liberality or scrupulosity, Paul avers that the Christians must

> Let not then your good be evil spoken of, . .[3]
> Overthrow not for meat's sake the work of God.[4]

Paul's teaching not only appears intelligible, but to have been demanded by the situations he faced. If the doctrine of forbearance seems to be a compromise (as undoubtedly it is) it must be remembered that Paul, unlike Jesus, who preached freedom and love without attempting to reconcile them, was attempting to build a church, and that in the building he was compelled to interpret and modify his mystico-ethic in ways which would make possible the participation in Christian fellowship of men and women of various racial, social, and religious backgrounds. Freedom was the charter

---

1 I Cor 6:12; 10:23; 10:31; 10:24. 2 Rom 14:20.

3 Rom 14:16. 4 Rom 14:20.

any member present, the Christian will be well to refrain from eating, lest he prejudice an unbeliever, or violate the weak conscience of a brother. Against this background Paul's teaching on forbearance becomes entirely intelligible.[1]

The same spirit of forbearance is advocated in Rom 14:1 - 15:13. Although the meat-eating problem here is not complicated by idol-consecration, the same spirit of forbearance is invoked. Paul insists that all things are clean,[2] but that "it is evil for that man who eateth with offence."[3] Whether of liberality or scrupulosity, Paul warns that the Christians must

> let not then your good be evil spoken of . . .[3]
>
> Overthrow not for meat's sake the work of God.[4]

Paul's teaching not only appears intelligible, but to have been demanded by the situation he faced. If the doctrine of forbearance seems to be a compromise (as undoubtedly it is) it must be remembered that Paul, unlike Jesus, who preached freedom and love without attempting to reconcile them, was attempting to build a church, and that in the building he was compelled to interpret and modify his mentor-ship in ways which would make possible the participation in Christian fellowship of men and women of various racial, social, and religious backgrounds. Freedom was the character

---

1 1 Cor 6:12; 10:23; 10:31; 13:2. 2 Rom 14:20.

3 Rom 14:16. 4 Rom 14:20.

of the new life, but taking people as he found them, bound oftentimes by outworn sanctions which they had not yet sloughed off, Paul was forced to "temper the wind" until they could grow up into the fulness of the stature of Christ.

Forbearance, therefore, must be regarded as a moral teaching formulated in terms of Paul's and believers' mystical relation to Christ and to each other, and of their ethical obligation to promote the good of each other. Such teaching is the work of a religious consciousness in which the mystical and ethical elements were fused.

Edification The teaching of I Cor 12-14 concerning the use of the charismata, or spiritual gifts, is pointed toward the moral end of edification. The word οἰκοδομή derives its meaning from Paul's metaphor of the building up of the church[1] or of the spiritual life.[2] This metaphorical sense of the word is peculiar to Paul. He assumes that the gifts of prophecy and tongues have the capacity to build up men's characters, quickening their wills and encouraging their spirits.

The trouble with the πνευματικοί at Corinth is their arrogant selfishness. They are not only unwilling to forego personal privileges, but they hold in contempt those who do not speak with

---

1 I Cor 3:9. (So Robertson and Plummer, "I Corinthians," (I C C), p.59)

2 I Cor 14:3; cf. Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 306.

of the new life, but taking people as he found them, bound down by ties by outward associations which they had not yet sloughed off, Paul was forced to "temper the wind" until they could grow up into the fullness of the stature of Christ.

Forbearance, therefore, must be regarded as a moral bending formulated in terms of Paul's and believers' mystical relation to Christ and to each other, and of their ethical obligation to promote the good of each other. Such bending is the work of a religious consciousness in which the mystical and ethical elements were fused.

Edification The teaching of I Cor 12-14 concerning the use of the charismata, or spiritual gifts, is pointed toward the moral and of edification. The word οἰκοδομή derives the meaning from Paul's metaphor of the building up of the church,[1] or of the spiritual life.[2] This metaphorical sense of the word is peculiar to Paul. He assumes that the gifts of prophecy and tongues have the capacity to build up man's character, quickening their wills and encouraging their spirits.

The trouble with the pneumatics at Corinth is their arrogant selfishness. They are not only unwilling to forego personal privilege, but they hold in contempt those who do not speak with

---

1 I Cor 8:1. (So Robertson and Plummer, "I Corinthians," (I.C.C.): p.69)

2 I Cor 14:5; cf. Robertson and Plummer, op. cit., p. 306.

tongues as they do. Their discrimination has become highly inimical to the welfare of the new fellowship. Paul is therefore compelled to deal with them not only on the question of idol-meat, but on the question of the use of the charismata as well.

Paul plunges into a discussion of the "diversities of gifts" with an eye to demonstrating the organic connectedness of every charismatic function.[1] He effects this demonstration by an appeal to the human body, and declares climactically,

> Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.[2]

He shows the superiority of prophecy to glossolalia: prophecy may prove helpful to all, while tongue-speaking, without interpretation, proves edifying only to the individual. His exhortation is that they

> desire earnestly the greater gifts,[3]

and

> Let all things be done unto edifying.[4]

Although I Cor 12 and 14 are not properly concerned with ethical problems as such, but rather with worship in the congregation, a vital moral principle is at stake. What Paul is seeking to make plain is that

> Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth.[5]

The great thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians is a moving tribute to the edifying power of love. Love, more than prophecy or tongues or

---

1 I Cor 12:4-11. 2 I Cor 12:27. 3 I Cor 12:31.

4 I Cor 14:26. 5 I Cor 8:1.

tongues as they do. Their discrimination has become highly inimical to the welfare of the new fellowship. Paul is therefore compelled to deal with them not only on the question of idol-meat, but on the question of the use of the charisms as well.

Paul plunges into a discussion of the "diversities of gifts" with an eye to demonstrating the organic connectedness of every charismatic function.[1] He effects this demonstration by an appeal to the human body, and declares climactically,

Now ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof.[2]

He shows the superiority of prophecy to glossolalia: prophecy may prove helpful to all, while tongue-speaking, without interpretation, proves edifying only to the individual. He concludes as that they

desire earnestly the greater gifts,[3]

and

Let all things be done unto edifying.[4]

Although I Cor 12 and 14 are not properly concerned with ethical problems as such, but rather with morals in the congregation, a vital moral principle is at stake. What Paul is seeking to make plain is that

Knowledge puffeth up, but love edifieth.[5]

The great thirteenth chapter of I Corinthians is a moving tribute to the edifying power of love. Here, more than prophecy or tongues or

---

1 I Cor 12:1-11. 2 I Cor 12:27. 3 I Cor 12:31.

4 I Cor 14:26. 5 I Cor 8:1.

knowledge, builds up the fellowship. The solidarity and harmony of the fellowship is the consideration of prime importance; no individual exercise of gifts can be countenanced if its net result is to disrupt the fellowship.

Thus in Paul's teaching on edification the mystico-ethical formulation of his moral instruction is again illustrated. The standard of edification derives from his sense of the importance and value of a mystical fellowship of believers which he calls the body of Christ. His moral teaching is an appeal to the building up of that body. His standard is therefore religious in character, and the moral attitude he exalts as the way to the attainment of the standard is love, a creative power given to the individual who is in fellowship with Christ.

Miscellaneous social virtues

Throughout the Pauline letters the mystico-ethical formulation of his moral teaching receives additional, though often indirect, illustration in a variety of virtues which need only be enumerated here. Peace is the bond which holds members of the fellowship in unity;[1] it is of God,[2] and he himself has called them to peace.[3] Unity of mind is advocated by Paul as the antidote for constant bickering and contentiousness.[4] To maintain the fellowship each member must wear the cloak of

---

1 Eph 4:3. 2 Rom 15:33, 16:20; I Cor 14:33; II Cor 13:11; Phil 4:9; I Thes 5:23.

3 Col 3:15; I Cor 7:15; cf. Rom 14:19; Phil 4:7.

4 Rom 12:16, 15:5; II Cor 13:11; Phil 2:2,4:2; I Cor 1:10; I Thes 5:13; II Thes 3:16.

knowledge, unlike our the fellowship. The authority and harmony of the fellowship is the consideration of prime importance; no individual exercise of gifts can be countenanced if its net result is to disrupt the fellowship.

Thus in Paul's teaching on edification the practico-ethical formulation of the moral instruction is again illustrated. The standard of edification derives from his sense of the importance and value of a mystical fellowship of believers which he calls the body of Christ. His moral teaching is an appeal to the building up of that body. The standard is therefore religious in character, and the moral relations he exalts as the way to the attainment of the standard is love, a creative power given to the individual who is in fellowship with Christ.

Miscellaneous social virtues

Throughout the Pauline letters the practico-ethical formulation of his moral teaching receives additional, though often indirect, illustration in a variety of virtues which need only be enumerated here. Peace is the bond which holds members of the fellowship in unity;[1] it is of God,[2] and is herself has called them to peace.[3] Unity of mind is exhorted by Paul as the antidote for consistent bickering and quarrelsomeness.[4] To maintain the fellowship each member must pay the price of

---

1 Eph 4:3. 2 Rom 15:33, 16:20; 1 Cor 14:33; 11 Cor 13: 11; Phil 4:9; 1 Thes 5:23.

3 Col 3:15; 1 Cor 7:15; cf. Rom 14:19; Phil 4:7.

4 Rom 12:16, 15:5; 11 Cor 13:11; Phil 2:2,4:2; 1 Cor 1:10; 1 Thes 5:13; 11 Thes 3:15.

humility;[1] glory belongs not to man, but to God;[2] Paul himself avoids boasting, and maintains an attitude of humility.[3] Gentleness,[4] sweet reasonableness,[5] kindness,[6] slowness to anger,[7] and a consistent sense of responsibility for one's brother,[8] are necessary to the perfection of the fellowship. Relief of the poor,[9] not because alms-giving is a particular virtue, but because the unfortunate members of the fellowship must be cared for, and hospitality[10] are expected of all members of the body of Christ. These social virtues are invoked by Paul to one purpose, - the building up of the new fellowship of believers.

Wider social relationships

In the wider social relationships Paul's ethic is anything but revolutionary. He contemplates no essential change, for example, in the relationship of the citizen to the state, or of the slave to his master, or of husband to wife. He never approaches these relationships from a purely ethical point of view; for him the modern problems of economic and

---

1 Rom 12:10, 11:18, 12:16; Phil 2:3; I Cor 1:18-31; II Cor 10:12.

2 Gal 6:14; I Cor 3:6. 3 Phil 4:13; I Cor 15:10; II Cor 2:17, 1:12f.

4 II Cor 10:1; I Cor 4:21; Gal 6:1; Eph 4:2; cf. Col 3:12.

5 II Cor 10:1; cf.Phil 4:5. 6 Col 3:12.

7 II Cor 6:6; Gal 5:22; cf. I Cor 13:4.

8 Gal 6:1; II Thes 3:15; I Thes 5:15; Col 3:16; Rom 12:14, 17, 21.

9 Rom 12:13; Eph 4:28; Rom 15:25ff.; I Cor 16:1ff., II Cor 8, 9.

10 Rom 12:17; cf. Phile v. 22; Rom 16:1.

<u>Humility</u>:[1] glory belongs not to men, but to God;[2] Jesus himself evolves boasting, and exhibits an attitude of humility.[3] Gentleness,[4] sweet reasonableness,[5] kindness,[6] allegiance to anyone,[7] and a consistent sense of responsibility for God's Kingdom,[8] are necessary to the perfection of the fellowship. Relief of the poor,[9] not possess aims-giving is a particular virtue, but because the interests members of the fellowship must be cared for, and <u>hospitality</u>[10] is expected of all members of the body of Christ. These social virtues are involved by Paul to one purpose, - the building up of the new fellowship of believers.

Wider social relationships — In the wider social relationships Paul's ethic is anything but revolutionary. He contemplates no essential change, for example, in the relationship of the citizen to the state, or of the slave to his master, or of husband to wife. He never approaches these relationships from a purely ethical point of view; for him the modern problems of economic and

---

1 Rom 12:10, 11:16, 12:16; Phil 2:3; 1 Cor 1:19-31; II Cor 10:12.

2 Gal 6:14; I Cor 3:6. 3 Phil 4:12; I Cor 15:10; II Cor 3:17, 1:12f.

4 II Cor 10:1; I Cor 4:21; Gal 6:1; Eph 4:2; cf. Col 3:12.

5 II Cor 10:1; cf. Phil 4:5. 6 Col 3:12.

7 II Cor 6:5; Gal 5:20; cf. I Cor 12:4.

8 Gal 6:1; II Thes 3:15; I Thes 5:15; Col 3:16; Rom 12:14, 17, 21.

9 Rom 12:13; Eph 4:28; Rom 15:26f.; I Cor 16:1f., II Cor 8, 9.

10 Rom 12:17; cf. Philo v. 22; Rom 16:1.

social justice never arose. His characteristic attitude is that the fellowship can be realized under the existing social order. Thus he accepts slavery as one of the institutions of his time; there is no evidence that he disapproved of it. His belief in the speedy coming of the Parousia gives rise to his doctrine of the status quo: "remain as you are." One angle from which he approaches slavery is that of the relation of the slave to his master. He enjoins strict obedience, in order that the fellowship in which both slave and master participate may be preserved. The service of slaves to masters Paul views as service to Christ.[1] Masters are to be honored, and in cases where both slaves and masters are members of the fellowship, the slave is not to despise his master, but serve him as a brother. The ground for such conduct Paul explicitly states:

> . . . they that partake of the benefit are believing and beloved.[2]

The slave is a free man in Christ;[3] the distinction between bond and free is wiped out along with the distinction between male and female, circumcision and uncircumcision.[4] Onesimus returns to Philemon as a brother, though still a slave. But the master must be fair and just to his slave,[5] since brutal or unfair treatment on his part will bring speedy recompense from God, who is the Master

---

1 Col 3:24; Eph 6:5. 2 I Tim 6:1-4. 3 I Cor 7:22.

4 I Cor 12:13; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11.

5 Col 4:1.

social justice never cross. His characteristic attitude is that the fellowship can be realized under the existing social order. Thus he accepts slavery as one of the institutions of his times; there is no evidence that he disapproved of it. His belief in the speedy coming of the Parousia gives rise to his admonitions of the status quo: "remain as you are." One angle from which he approves slavery is that of the relation of the slave to his master. He enjoins strict obedience, in order that the fellowship in which both slave and master participate may be preserved. His service of slaves to masters Paul views as service to Christ.[1] Masters are to be honored, and in cases where both slaves and masters are members of the fellowship, the slave is not to despise his master, but serve him as a brother. The ground for such conduct Paul explicitly states:

> . . . they that partake of the benefit are believing and beloved.[2]

The slave is a free man in Christ;[3] the distinction between bond and free is wiped out along with the distinction between male and female, circumcision and uncircumcision.[4] Onesimus returns to Philemon as a brother, though still a slave. But the master must be fair and just to his slave,[5] since brutal or unfair treatment on his part will bring speedy recompense from God, who is the master

---

1 Col 4:14; Eph 6:5. 2 1 Tim 6:1-. 3 1 Cor 7:22.

4 1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11.

5 Col 4:1.

of masters.

In the same way Paul looks at the marriage relationship. The mystical fellowship of believers which constitutes the body of Christ includes both man and wife. Paul deliberately integrates marriage with his idea of the body of Christ:

> the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.[1]

Marriage involves no incompatibility with being in Christ. But once married, believers are not to separate, but hold fast their union. The rights and privileges of both man and wife are to be strictly observed.[2] Cessation of conjugal relations is enjoined only to the end that

> ye may give yourselves unto prayer.[3]

Husbands are urged to love their wives, and to cleave to them.[4] Even where a believer is joined to an unbeliever the union is to be preserved,[5]

> for the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother: else were your children unclean, but now they are holy.[6]

Yet Paul is willing to allow separation of an unbeliever from a believer should the former depart, on the ground that the eventual

---

1 I Cor 11:3. 2 I Cor 7:1-5. 3 I Cor 7:5.

4 Eph 5:25, 28; Col 3:19; Eph 5:31.

5 I Cor 7:12, 13. 6 I Cor 7:14.

of matters.

In the same way Paul looks at the marriage relationship. The spiritual fellowship of believers which constitutes the body of Christ includes both man and wife. Paul faithfully integrates marriage with his idea of the body of Christ:

> the head of every man is Christ; and the head of the woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God.[1]

Marriage involves no incompatibility with being in Christ. But once married, believers are not to separate, but hold fast their union. The rights and privileges of both man and wife are to be strictly observed.[2] Cessation of conjugal relations is sanctioned only to the end that

> Ye may give yourselves unto prayer.[3]

Husbands are urged to love their wives, and to cleave to them.[4] Even where a believer is joined to an unbeliever the union is to be preserved.[5]

> For the unbelieving husband is sanctified in the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified in the brother: else were your children unclean, but now they are holy.[6]

Yet Paul is willing to allow separation of an unbeliever from a believer should the former depart. On the ground that the eventual

---

1 1 Cor 11:3. 2 1 Cor 7:1-5. 3 1 Cor 7:5.

4 Eph 5:25, 28; Col 3:19; Eph 5:31.

5 1 Cor 7:12, 13. 6 1 Cor 7:14.

salvation of the unbeliever is never fully assured.[1]

For the unmarried and widows Paul prescribes the continuance of the single state, unless incontinency demands wedlock.[2] He believes that widows will be happier if they abide as they are.[3] He freely confesses that his advice concerning virgins (unmarried daughters, not as Enslin suggests,[4] "a group of men and women who had taken certain vows of chastity and so were (living) together in a sort of spiritual marriage") is not based upon any commandment of Jesus, but upon his own judgment. Here Paul's compromise with the exigencies of his world view is clearly evident. The approaching Parousia constrains him to advocate celibacy for all who can stand it,[5] but the continuance of the status quo for those already married.[6] To the argument that the Parousia would soon come, thus rendering superfluous any perpetuation of the race, Paul adds a second argument for remaining single: he would have them free from all cares.[7] Unmarried believers would be concerned only with pleasing the Lord, while married believers divide their interests between the Lord and their mates.[8] But marriage is no sin;[9] the father who gives his daughter in marriage does well, but he who

---

1 I Cor 7:15-16. 2 I Cor 7:8,9. 3 I Cor 7:40.

4 The Ethics of Paul, p. 177; cf. Robertson and Plummer, "I Cor" (I C C), p. 151.

5 I Cor 7:9. 6 I Cor 7:24, 26. 7 I Cor 7:32.

8 I Cor 7:32-35. 9 I Cor 7:35.

salvation of the unbeliever is never fully assured.[1]

For the unmarried and widows Paul prescribes the continence of the single state, unless incontinency demands wedlock.[2] He believes that widows will be happier if they abide as they are.[3] He freely concedes that his advice concerning virgins (unmarried daughters, not as Conzelmann says,[4] "a group of men and women who had taken certain vows of chastity and so were living together in a sort of spiritual marriage") is not based upon any commandment of Jesus, but upon his own judgment. Here Paul's compromise with the exigencies of his world view is clearly evident. The apparently paradoxic conclusion him to advocate celibacy for all who can stand it,[5] but the continuance of the status quo for those already married.[6] To the argument that the parousia would soon come, thus rendering superfluous any perpetuation of the race, Paul adds a second argument for remaining single: he would have them free from all cares.[7] Unmarried believers would be concerned only with pleasing the Lord, while married believers divide their interests between the Lord and their mates.[8] But marriage is no sin;[9] the father who gives his daughter in marriage does well, but he who

---

1 1 Cor 7:12-16. 2 1 Cor 7:8,9. 3 1 Cor 7:40.

4 The Mission of Paul, p. 177; cf. Robertson and Plummer, "1 Cor" (I C.C), p. 161.

5 1 Cor 7:8. 6 1 Cor 7:24, 26. 7 1 Cor 7:32.

8 1 Cor 7:32-35. 9 1 Cor 7:36.

withholds his daughter does better.[1]

We have in Paul's teaching on marriage an admittedly compromise ethic. His conviction that celibacy as a state was advisable in view of the impending Parousia represents the compromise element. But in his teaching on both marriage and slavery the impelling motive is that of preserving the peace and harmony of the Christian fellowship. In a sense, therefore, the formulation of his teaching on these subjects, as on all others we have considered, is mystico-ethical in character. Paul's ethical admonitions would not have been what they are had he not been dominated in all his thought and activity by a compelling sense of fellowship with Jesus Christ.

Summary - Paul's Teaching on Social Morality

In our study of Paul's teaching on social relationships we found an even more clearly defined mystico-ethical formulation than in his teaching on individual morality. We marked the expression σῶμα Χριστοῦ as the representative mystico-ethical term. We saw that Paul's aim is to preserve and enhance the fellowship of those in fellowship with Christ; that his appeal is to a type of conduct that is both worthy of that fellowship and conducive to the preservation of its unity. The σῶμα Χριστοῦ becomes for Paul the mystico-ethical sanction for right social attitudes.

The ethical impulse of the new fellowship is love. We

---

1 I Cor 7:38.

noted various aspects of Paul's use of this term: love is the moral counterpart of mystic faith, the bond of the new fellowship, the fulfilment of the law, the new substitute for moral legalism, the all embracing social virtue from which all others spring. Love is the power of God as manifested in Christ, received through mystical fellowship with Christ. When released in human life love becomes the creative activity through which the welfare of others is enhanced, the edification of the church achieved, and the bond of fellowship perfected.

Accordingly we traced the mystico-ethical formulation of Paul's social teaching through four aspects of love, and saw how, in the case of forbearance and edification, the principle of individual freedom and the exercise of spiritual functions was conditioned by the broader, deeper principle of loving regard for the welfare of others. We noted a miscellany of minor virtues urged by Paul toward the same end, namely, the perfection of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ . We observed finally that in his teaching on such relationships as marriage and slavery Paul combines the compromise element due to his eschatological world-view with the mystico-ethical sanction of the σῶμα Χριστοῦ .

Limitations and strength of Paul's practical teaching

We conceive Paul's practical moral teaching to be subject to two limitations. We have already taken note of the first, - his eschatology. Paul's expectation of the end of the world and the return of

noted various aspects of Paul's use of this term: love is the moral sanction of agape ratio, the ground of the new fellowship, the fulfillment of the law, the new substitute for moral legalism, the all embracing social virtue from which all others spring. Love as the power of God as manifested in Christ, received through personal fellowship with Christ. When released in human life love becomes the creative activity through which the welfare of others is enhanced, the edification of the church achieved, and the bond of fellowship perfected.

Lastly we traced the agape-ethical formulation of Paul's social teaching through four aspects of love, and saw how, in the case of forbearance and edification, the principle of individual freedom and the morales of spiritual transition were conditioned by the broader, larger principle of loving regard for the welfare of others. We noted a miscellany of minor virtues urged by Paul toward the same end, namely, the protection of the fellow [illegible]. We observed finally that in his treatise on such relationships as marriage and slavery Paul combines the conservative element due to his eschatological world-view with the agape-ethical sanction of the fellow [illegible].

Liberty, love and strength. In conclusion Paul's practical moral teaching of Paul's practical teaching seemingly to be subject to two limitations. We have already taken note of the first, - his eschatology. Paul's expectation of the end of the world and the return of

Jesus seriously modified his teaching on marriage and slavery, and may unconsciously have influenced much of his other teaching. The second limitation is due to the restricted character of Paul's purpose. Paul was writing to Christian converts who formed the Christian community, and the problems he treated are the problems which arose within the limits of that fellowship. Therefore his moral teaching is not universal, but particular; it is an informal, miscellaneous body of moral admonitions given for the express purpose of meeting immediate individual and social needs growing out of concrete situations within the bounds of the Christian fellowship.[1]

But this limitation on Paul's ethics is from another point of view, a bulwark of strength. His admonitions carried weight and exerted great appeal precisely because his readers had one great thing in common: their experience of Christ. This common experience Paul sets in the central place of his teaching; all his moral exhortations hinge upon it, derive force from it, appeal to it. He formulated his ethical sanctions in terms of his readers' individual and social experience of Christ. Since he conceived that fellowship mystically, his teaching is formulated

---

1 Weinel, St. Paul, the Man and His Work, p. 330 says,

> (Paul) is guided in his inquiry by an immediate ethical feeling for the 'natural' human groups, husband and wife, the family, society, and the State - but he does not examine them as a moral philosopher. It is not, after all, a system of social ethics, in the proper sense of the word, that St. Paul has left us.

Jesus seriously modified his teaching on marriage and slavery, and may unconsciously have influenced much of his other teaching. The general limitation is due to the restricted character of Paul's purpose. Paul was writing to Christian converts who formed the Christian community, and the problems he treated are the problems which arose within the limits of that fellowship. Therefore his moral teaching is not universal, but particular; it is an informal, miscellaneous body of moral admonitions given for the express purpose of meeting immediate individual and social needs, working out of concrete situations within the bounds of the Christian fellowship.[1]

But this limitation on Paul's ethics is from another point of view, a subject of strength. His admonitions carried weight and exerted great moral power precisely because his readers had one great thing in common: their experience of Christ. This common experience Paul sets in the central place of his teaching; all his moral exhortations hinge upon it, derive force from it, appeal to it. He formulated his ethical sanctions in terms of his readers' individual and social experiences of Christ. Hence he conceived that fellowship practically. His teaching is formulated

---

1 Weinel, St. Paul, the man and his work, p. 370 seq.

(Paul) is guided in his inquiry by an immediate practical feeling for the 'natural' means proper, husband and wife, the family, society, and the State - but he does not examine them as a moral philosopher. It is not, after all, a system of social ethics, in the proper sense of the word, that St. Paul has left us.

in mystico-ethical terms. The sanctions he invokes, the motives he encourages, the warnings he issues, the goals he holds up, all bear the mark of a religious consciousness in which the predominating element is an immediate, personal relationship with Jesus Christ. Though he did not receive his moral ideas mystically, he does formulate them in terms of mystical experience.

Chapter X

Statement of Thesis

and

Recapitulation of Argument

Statement of the Thesis

The problem of this dissertation is the discovery and characterization of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics. The thesis presented as the solution to the problem holds that the presence of the personal Christ, mystically experienced, re-created Paul by setting him in right relationship with God, and by endowing him with personal moral power which both enabled him to fulfill the ethical demands of his life and determined the formulation of his ethical demands upon others.

Recapitulation of the Argument

I

Mysticism and Religion

The term "mysticism" is used in this thesis to mean religious mysticism. Though it is possible to conceive of types of mysticism which are non-religious in character, in the accepted sense mysticism is used to characterize a type of religion. From the point of view of religion as a whole, the mystical is but one component element. The institutional or historical, the rational or philosophical, and the volitional or moral elements must be recognized as operative in all wholesome types of religious experience. Even in mystical religious experience these elements play important, though often subordinate, parts.

The common meaning of the term "mysticism" has been derived from the life and experience of certain individuals and groups within the bounds of the Christian church. Christian

Statement of the Thesis

The problem of this dissertation is the discovery and characterization of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics. The thesis presented as the solution to the problem holds that the presence of the personal Christ, mystically experienced, re-created Paul by setting him in right relationship with God, and by endowing him with personal moral power which both enabled him to FULFILL the ethical demands of his life and determined the formulation of his ethical demands upon others.

Conceptualization of the Argument

I

Mysticism and Religion

The term "mysticism" is used in this dissertation to mean religious mysticism. Though it is possible to conceive of types of mysticism which are non-religious in character, in the accepted sense mysticism is used to characterize a type of religion. From the point of view of religion as a whole, the mystical is but one component element. The institutional or ritualistic, the rational or philosophical, and the volitional or moral elements must be recognized as operative in all wholesome type of religious experience. Even in mystical religious experience these elements play important, though often subordinate, parts.

The common meaning of the term "mysticism" has been derived from the life and experience of certain individuals and groups within the bounds of the Christian church. Mysticism

mysticism flowered in the fourth, the fourteenth, and the seventeenth centuries. The characteristics of mysticism as found in its great historic exponents are as follows: (1) the effort of the individual to realize direct contact with, knowledge of, and identification with the divine nature; (2) reliance upon inner, spiritual faculties in the quest for God; (3) the practice of spiritual disciplines; (4) revitalized moral activity in the world. The mystic employs a definite technique in his cultivation of the awareness of God. His claim to special knowledge of God through immediate experience, though denied by many psychologists, cannot be ruled out finally. The strong admixture of emotion in the mystic way of knowing suggests that the qualitative character of mystic knowledge may be different from that of knowledge gained through ordinary thought processes.

II Mysticism and Ethics

Although it is possible to discover ethical systems without religious reference, religious systems without ethical reference are rare. Historically, religion and ethics develop in marked interaction. Within Christianity the relation of religion to ethics may be characterized in the following ways: (1) In the interaction of the two elements, religion is primary; ethics becomes <u>religious</u> ethics; moral precepts and experience are the deliverance of the religious consciousness. (2) Through religious experience the hard striving after moral perfection is transformed into a joyous experience of moral power. (3) The religious life is implemented by the moral life, and (4), tested by it. (5) The interaction is illustrated in the Christian's

mysticism flowered in the fourth, the fifteenth century, and by seventeenth century. The characteristics of mysticism as found in the great historic exponents are as follows: (1) the effort of the individual to realize direct contact with, knowledge of, and identification with the divine nature; (2) reliance upon inner, spiritual receptivity in the quest for God; (3) the practice of spiritual discipline; (4) revitalized moral activity in the world. The mystic employs a definite technique in his activities of the awareness of God. He claims to special knowledge of God through immediate experience, though denied by many psychologists, cannot be ruled out finally. The strong admixture of emotion in the mystic way of knowing suggests that the qualitative character of mystic knowledge may be different from that of knowledge gained through ordinary thought processes.

II
Mysticism
and
Ethics

Although it is possible to discover ethical mysticism without religious reference, religion and ethics generally, religion and ethics deeply interwoven. Within mysticism without ethical reference are rare. Mysticism the relation of religion to ethics may be characterized in the following ways: (1) in the interaction of the two elements, religion is primary; ethics becomes religious ethics; moral precepts and experience are the deliverance of the religious consciousness. (2) Strong religious experience the moral driving other moral performance is translated into a joyous experience of moral power. (3) The religious life is implemented by the moral life, and (4), tested by it. (5) The interaction is illustrated in the mysticism

mutually modifying experiences of faith and love. Christian mystical religion in its best forms manifests these same characteristics. Direct moral outcomes of mystical experience are discernible in the lives of the great Christian exponents of mystical religion.

III
The Mystical Element in Paul

The personality of Paul was well adapted to mystical experience. His sensitive psycho-physical organism, passionate nature, religious devotion, zeal, and enthusiasm, mental energy, and susceptibility to visions and revelations stamp him as a type of person naturally predisposed to mystical experience. The Damascus conversion must be regarded as the initial mystical experience of Paul. Here Paul saw Jesus, and through him came into an immediate experience of God. This direct, personal contact with Christ Paul construed as an authentic appearance of the risen Jesus to him, and as a call to his apostleship.

The Damascus experience marked the beginning of Paul's continuing fellowship with Christ. The post-conversion expressions of Paul's mysticism, typically represented by the phrases "ἐν Χριστῷ," "Christ in Paul," "Paul in Christ," "faith," "fellowship," and "the body of Christ," reveal the personal, dynamic character of his mysticism. Though characterized essentially as "Christ-mysticism," it is apparent that through his mystical experience Paul felt himself related both to God, through

mutually modifying experiences of faith and love. Christian mystical religion in its best form manifests these generalities. Direct moral outcomes of mystical experiences are discernible in the lives of the great Christian exponents of mystical religion.

III

The Mystical Element in Paul: The personality of Paul was well adapted to mystical experience. His sensitive psycho-physical organism, passionate nature, religious devotion, zeal, and enthusiasm, mental energy, and susceptibility to visions and revelations stamp him as a type of person naturally predisposed to mystical experience. The Damascus conversion must be regarded as the initial mystical experience of Paul. Here Paul saw Jesus, and through him came into an immediate experience of God. This direct, personal contact with Christ, not construed as an outward appearance of the risen Jesus to him, and as a call to his apostleship.

The Damascus experience marked the beginning of Paul's continuing fellowship with Christ. The post-conversion experiences of Paul's apostleship, typically represented by the phrases "ev Χριστῷ," "united in Paul," "Paul in Christ," "faith," "fellowship," and "the body of Christ," reveal the personal, dynamic character of his mystic union. Though misunderstood essentially as "Christ-mysticism," it is apparent that through his mystical experience Paul felt himself related both to God, through

Christ, and to the continuing historical personality, Jesus. His interchangeable use of the terms God, Christ, and Spirit indicates that however he may have distinguished the three in rank and nature, in experience he regarded their work as essentially the same.

Paul's mysticism possesses its own marked individuality. (1) It is free from the self-conscious, deliberately applied technique so common to the later mystics of the church; (2) it manifests a positive attitude toward life in the world; (3) it is the first instance of what may be called a "God-through-Christ" mysticism: here for the first time a Christian seeks relationship with God through a personal experience of the continuing historical personality, Christ Jesus; (4) it is both personal and social in character; (5) it possesses an extraordinarily strong ethical emphasis. Paul's mysticism is not one of absorption or loss of personality in the Absolute; it is "Mystik," not "Mysticismus." It is best understood in terms of intimate relationships between persons.

IV
The Ethical Element in Paul

The ethical interest claims a surprisingly large share of the Pauline literary material. That ethical interest is of two kinds, corresponding to the two conditioning factors of his experience which gave rise to them; first, that which reflects the bearing of his personal religion upon his moral experience, and second, that which deals practically with the moral problems

Christ, and to the continuing historical personality, Jesus. The interchangeable use of the terms God, Christ, and Spirit indicates that however he may have distinguished the three in work and nature, in experience he regarded their work as essentially the same.

Fox's mysticism possesses its own marked individuality. (1) It is free from the self-conscious, deliberately applied technique so common to the lower mystics of the church; (2) it manifests a positive attitude toward life in the world; (3) it is the first instance of what may be called a "God-through-Christ" mysticism: here for the first time a Christian seeks reintimacy with God through a personal experience of the continuing historical personality, Christ Jesus; (4) it is both personal and social in character; (5) it possesses an extraordinarily strong ethical emphasis. Fox's mysticism is not one of absorption or loss of personality in the Absolute; it is "mystical," not "pantheistic." It is best understood in terms of intimate relationships between persons.

II
The Ethical Element in Fox

The ethical interest claims a surprisingly large share of the Friends literary material. This ethical interest is of two kinds, corresponding to the two conditioning factors of his experience which gave rise to them: first, that which reflects the bearing of his personal religion upon his moral experience, and second, that which deals practically with the moral problems

confronting his converts.

Paul's ethics exhibits no conscious dependence upon the ethics of Stoicism or the Mystery Religions. His ethical heritage from Judaism, though contributing largely to his stock of moral ideas, does not explain the ethics of Paul the Christian.

V

Paul's Personal Religious Problem and its Bearing upon his Moral Experience

Paul's absorbing passion was to know God, and to attain right relations with him. Through observance of the law, the prescribed method of Judaism, he failed to achieve the sense of reconciliation, peace, and harmony with God he so ardently sought. His experience under the law was therefore unsatisfactory. Though he kept the law blamelessly, he failed to find acceptance with God. Instead, he felt condemned and defeated. The law failed to save him because it offered him no personal help in his effort to fulfill it. It was inert, impersonal, powerless.

Through personal relationship to Jesus Paul attained that right relationship with God which he had unsuccessfully sought through the law. Christ did for him what the law could not do. Christ restored him to a relationship of peace and harmony with God. The grace of God, manifesting itself in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, mystically apprehended by faith, supplanted in Paul's life the inadequate religious plan of Judaism. Through Christ-mysticism, therefore, Paul came to a victorious

contradicting his converts.

Paul's ethics exhibit no conscious dependence upon the ethics of scholism or the mystery religions. His ethical heritage from Judaism, though contributing largely to his stock of moral ideas, does not explain the ethics of Paul the Christian.

V

Paul's Personal Religious Problem and its Bearing upon his Moral Experience

Paul's absorbing passion was to know God, and to obtain right relations with him. Through observance of the law, the prescribed method of Judaism, he failed to achieve the sense of reconciliation, peace, and harmony with God to be anybody enough. His experience under the law was therefore unsatisfactory. Though he kept the law religiously, he failed to find acceptance with God. Instead, he felt condemned and defeated. The law failed to save him because it offered him no personal help in his effort to fulfill it. It was inert, impersonal, powerless.

Through personal relationship to Jesus Paul achieved that right relationship with God which he had unsuccessfully sought through the law. Christ did for him what the law could not do. Christ restored him to a relationship of peace and harmony with God. The grace of God, manifestating itself in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ, mystically apprehended by faith, supplanted in Paul's life the inadequate religious plan of Judaism. Through Christ-mysticism, therefore, Paul came to a victorious

solution of his great religious problem.

This solution had a very definite bearing upon Paul's moral experience. Through Christ a moral re-creation was wrought in him. He experienced an ingress of moral power; the love of God became his power of moral action. Christ made ethical demands upon him, but provided his own presence as the power toward fulfilling those demands. Thus Paul's mysticism became morally dynamic. New energy for work, new strength with which to combat and overcome suffering and weakness were given him. The grace of God through Jesus Christ worked in him, stimulating and empowering his own will, though never supplanting it. This was the most profound effect of Paul's Christ-mysticism upon his moral life.

VI
The Relation of
Paul's Mysticism to
His Ethical Teaching

Paul's new experience of God through Christ definitely conditioned his ethical teaching among his converts. (1)

The Christ who lived in Paul as a present power became the new source of his ethics. Paul knew and taught among his converts the story of Jesus, which included the ethical teachings of Jesus. But Paul's characteristic ethical appeal was to the personal presence of Christ in the experience of his converts. Thus the mind of Christ superseded the words of Jesus in Paul's teaching. Paul's ethical teaching exhibits a remarkable harmony with, and understanding and application of, the ethics of Jesus. Jesus was the

solution of his great religious problem.

This solution had a very definite bearing upon Paul's moral experience. Through Christ a moral re-creation was wrought in him. He experienced an increase of moral power: the love of God became his power of moral action. Christ made ethical demands upon him, but provided his own presence as the power toward fulfilling those demands. Thus Paul's ethical problem became morally dynamic. New energy for work, new strength with which to combat and overcome suffering and weakness were given him. The grace of God through Jesus Christ worked in him, sanctifying and empowering his own will, though never supplanting it. This was the most profound effect of Paul's Christ-experience upon his moral life.

VI
The Relation of Paul's Religion to His Ethical Teaching

Paul's new experience of God through Christ definitely conditioned his ethical teaching among his converts. (1) The Christ who lived in Paul as a present power became the new source of his ethics. Paul knew and taught among his converts the story of Jesus, which included the ethical teachings of Jesus. Thus Paul's characteristic ethical appeal was to the personal presence of Christ in the experience of his converts. Thus the mind of Christ superseded the words of Jesus in Paul's teaching. Paul's ethical teaching exhibits a remarkable harmony with, and understanding and application of, the ethics of Jesus. Jesus was the

source of Paul's ethics in that all of Paul's ethical ideals were re-examined and remotivated in the light of his experience of Christ. (2) Paul's mystical experience of Christ gave to his ethic a new standard of conduct: life worthy of the fellowship in which Paul and other believers were joined to God in Christ. This standard, mystico-ethical in form, distinguishes Paul's ethics from philosophical ethics, and demonstrates its religious character. (3) Paul implemented mysticism with morality. He assumed that those in fellowship with Christ would conduct themselves in conformity with the character of Christ. The Spirit working in man bears moral fruits. (4) Paul tested mysticism by morality. He assumed that the validity of mystical experience is demonstrated by the moral character of the mystic. He regarded unethical or immoral conduct as a personal or social breach of faith. Daily conduct was the proving ground for mystic claims. (5) Paul illustrated the close relationship of his mysticism to his ethics by the use of the terms "faith" and "love," which represent, respectively, the mystical and the ethical aspects of his religious experience. Through faith man apprehends the love of God, and that love becomes in human life the power of ethical action.

VII
The Mystico-Ethical Formulation of Paul's Practical Teaching

These various aspects of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics find illustration in the voluminous body of practical teachings in his letters. So vivid was Paul's

source of Paul's advice in that all of Paul's ethical ideals were re-examined and reconsidered in the light of his experience of Christ. (2) Paul's spiritual experience of Christ gave to his ethic a new standard of conduct: life worthy of the fellowship in which Paul and other believers were joined to God in Christ. This standard, ethico-ethical in form, distinguishes Paul's ethics from philosophical ethics, and determines its religious character.

(3) Paul implemented his ethics with morality. He assumed that those in fellowship with Christ would conduct themselves in conformity with the character of Christ. The spirit working in them bears moral fruit. (4) Paul based mystical ethics by morality. He assumed that the validity of mystical experience is demonstrated by the moral character of the mystic. He rejected unethical or immoral conduct as a personal or social breach of faith. Godly conduct was the proving ground for mystic claims. (5) Paul illustrated the close relationship of his mysticism to his ethics by the use of the terms "faith" and "love," which represent, respectively, the mystical and the ethical aspects of his religious experience. Through faith we experience the love of God, and that love becomes in human life the power of ethical action.

VII

The Mystico-Ethical Formulation of Paul's Practical Teaching

These various aspects of the relation of Paul's mysticism to his ethics find illustration in the voluminous body of practical teaching in his letters. In view of Paul's

mystical experience of Christ that his teaching concerning the conduct of life among his converts was determined by it and formulated in terms of it. His ethical principles and sanctions are expressed in the language of mysticism. The καινὴ κτίσις and the σῶμα Χριστοῦ suggest on the one hand the supernatural work of the Christ-Spirit in the individual and the group, and on the other the high type of moral conduct expected of the individual and the group. In mystical fellowship with Christ the individual manifests attitudes of self-control, stedfastness, and courage; as a member of the body of Christ he exhibits on every hand love and forbearance. The maintenance of the unity of the mystical body of Christ and the preservation of the bond of peace constitute the motives for good conduct. Paul's ethical sanctions, warnings, and exhortations are conditioned by and formulated in terms of the mystical experience of Christ which he shared with all believers.

VIII Conclusion

The practical religious genius of Paul, and the secret of his undying influence upon historical Christianity, lie in the fusion of two dynamic elements in his religious experience: the mystical and the ethical. Through mystical fellowship with Jesus Christ, experienced immediately and personally, Paul came into a relationship of peace and harmony with God. The love of God which he discovered and experienced in his fellowship with Christ became in him the power of ethical action, endowed his own life with moral creativity, and determined the formulation of his moral teaching.

mystical experience of Christ that his teaching concerning the conduct of life among his converts was determined by it and formulated in terms of it. His ethical principles and sanctions are expressed in the language of mysticism. The Agape ἀγάπη and the ἐνώσις Χριστοῦ suggest on the one hand the supernatural work of the Christ-spirit in the individual and the group, and on the other the high type of moral conduct expected of the individual and the group. In mystical fellowship with Christ the individual manifests attitudes of self-control, ἐγκράτεια, and courage; as a member of the body of Christ he exhibits on every hand love and forbearance. The maintenance of the unity of the mystical body of Christ and the preservation of the bond of peace constitute the motives for good conduct. Paul's ethical sanctions, warnings, and exhortations are conditioned by and formulated in terms of the mystical experience of Christ which he shared with all believers.

VIII
Conclusion

The practical religious genius of Paul, and the secret of his undying influence upon historical Christianity, lie in the fusion of two dynamic elements in his religious experience: the mystical and the ethical. Through mystical fellowship with Jesus Christ, experienced immediately and personally, Paul came into a relationship of peace and harmony with God. The love of God which he discovered and experienced in his fellowship with Christ became in him the power of ethical action, endowed his own life with moral creativity, and determined the formulation of his moral teaching.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I

Religion, Mysticism, and Ethics

Angus, S., The Environment of Early Christianity. New York: Scribner, 1915.

Baillie, John, The Interpretation of Religion. New York: Scribner, 1928.

_____, The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul. New York: Doran, 1926.

Bakewell, C. M., A Source-Book in Ancient Philosophy. New York: Scribner, 1907.

Bennett, C.A.A., A Philosophical Study of Mysticism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1923.

Boehme, Jacob, The Signature of All Things. Introduction by Clifford Bax. London: Dent, 1912. (Everyman's Library)

Brightman, E.S., An Introduction to Philosophy. New York: Holt, 1925.

_____, Moral Laws. New York: Abingdon, 1933.

_____, A Philosophy of Ideals. New York: Holt, 1928.

_____, Religious Values. New York: Abingdon, 1925.

Butler, D.C., Western Mysticism. London: Constable, 1922.

Butler, J.F., "Psychology and the 'Numinous'", Journal of Religion. Vol. XIII, Number 4.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

I

Religion, Mysticism, and Ethics

Angus, S.. The Environment of Early Christianity. New York: Scribner, 1915.

Baillie, John. The Interpretation of Religion. New York: Scribner, 1929.

_____ The Roots of Religion in the Human Soul. New York: Harper, 1926.

Bakewell, C. M.. A Source-Book in Ancient Philosophy. New York: Scribner, 1907.

Burnett, G.A.A.. A Philosophical Study of Mysticism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1922.

Boehme, Jacob. The Signature of All Things. Introduction by Clifford Bax. London: Dent, 1912. (Everyman's Library)

Brightman, E.S.. An Introduction to Philosophy. New York: Holt, 1925.

_____ Moral Laws. New York: Abingdon, 1933.

_____ A Philosophy of Ideals. New York: Holt, 1928.

_____ Religious Values. New York: Abingdon, 1925.

Butler, D.C.. Western Mysticism. London: Constable, 1922.

Butler, E.M.. "Psychology and the 'Numinous'", Journal of Religion. Vol. XIII, Number 4.

Carpenter, J. E., "Religion," Encyclopedia Brittanica, Eleventh Edition. New York: Encyclopedia Brittanica Company, 1910. Vol. XXIII, pp. 61-76.

Carus, Paul, The Canon of Reason and Virtue. (Being Lao-tze's Tao Teh King, Chinese and English). Chicago: Open Court, 1927.

Coe, G. A., "Sources of the Mystical Revelation," Hibbert Journal, Vol. VI (1908), pp. 359 - 372.

_____, Psychology of Religion. Chicago: University Press, 1916.

Edgerton, Franklin, The Bhagavad Gita. Chicago: Open Court, 1925.

Everett, W. G., Moral Values. New York: Holt, 1918.

Eucken, Rudolph, The Truth of Religion. Second Edition, tr. by W. T. Jones. New York: Putnam's, 1913.

Fleming, W. K., Mysticism in Christianity. New York: Revell, 1913.

Hall, T. C., History of Ethics Within Organized Christianity. New York: Scribner, 1910.

Carpenter, J. E., "Religion," Encyclopedia Britannica. Nineteenth Edition. New York: Encyclopedia Britannica Company, 1910. Vol. XXIII, pp. 63-76.

Carus, Paul, The Canon of Reason and Virtue. (Lao-tse's Tao Teh King, Chinese and English). Chicago: Open Court, 1927.

Coe, G. A., "Sources of the Mystical Revelation," Hibbert Journal, Vol. VI (1908), pp. 363 - 372.

_____, Psychology of Religion. Chicago: University Press, 1916.

Edgerton, Franklin, The Bhagavad Gita. Chicago: Open Court, 1925.

Everett, W. G., Moral Values. New York: Holt, 1918.

Graham, Rudolph, The Truth of Religion. Second Edition, tr. by W. E. Cowen. New York: Putnam's, 1915.

Fleming, W. K., Mysticism in Christianity. New York: Bevan, 1917.

Hall, T. C., History of Ethics Within Organized Christianity. New York: Scribner, 1910.

Harnack, Adolf, Das Wesen des Christentums. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901. Eng. Tr., What Is Christianity? Second revised ed., tr. by T. B. Saunders. New York: Putnam's, 1901.

Hart, Bernard, The Psychology of Insanity. New York: Putnam's, 1919.

Heiler, Friedrich, Das Gebet. Eng. tr., Prayer, by Samuel McComb, with the assistance of J. E. Park. New York: Oxford, 1932.

Hermann, Emily, The Meaning and Value of Mysticism. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1915.

Hocking, W. E., The Meaning of God in Human Experience. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912.

_____, "The Meaning of Mysticism as Seen Through Its Psychology," Mind, N. S., XXI, (1912), pp. 38 - 61.

Höffding, Harald, The Philosophy of Religion. Tr. from the German ed. by B. E. Meyer. Second ed. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Harnack, Adolf. Das Wesen des Christentums. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901. Eng. Tr., What Is Christianity? Second revised ed., tr. by T. B. Saunders. New York: Putnam's, 1901.

Hart, Edward. The Psychology of Insanity. New York: Putnam's, 1912.

Heiler, Friedrich. Das Gebet. Eng. tr., Prayer, by Samuel McComb, with the assistance of J. E. Tyler. New York: Oxford, 1932.

Hocking, Emily. The Meaning and Value of Mysticism. Boston: Pilgrim Press, 1915.

Hocking, W. E. The Meaning of God in Human Experience. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1912.

_____. "The Meaning of Mysticism as Seen Through the Psychology," Mind, N. S., XXI, (1912), pp. 34 - 51.

Hoffding, Harald. The Philosophy of Religion. Tr. from the German ed. by B. E. Meyer. Second ed. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Hügel, Friedrich von, Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion. London: Dent, 1921.

_____, The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends. Two Vol. London: Dent, 1st ed., 1908; 2nd ed., 1923.

Inge, W. R., Christian Mysticism. The Bampton Lectures, 1899. Sixth ed. London: Methuen, 1925.

_____, Outspoken Essays. (First Series), London: Longmans, 1920.

_____, Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion. London and New York: Longmans, 1924.

James, William, The Varieties of Religious Experience. The Gifford Lectures, 1901-1902. New York: Longmans, 1902.

Jones, R. M., The Inner Life. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

_____, "Mysticism (Introductory)," and "Mysticism (Christian, N. T.)," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by James Hastings. New York: Scribner, 1917. Vol. IX, pp. 82 - 83, 89-90.

Hügel, Friedrich von. Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion. London: Dent, 1921.

———. The Mystical Element of Religion as Studied in Saint Catherine of Genoa and Her Friends. Two Vol. London: Dent, 1st ed., 1908; 2nd ed., 1923.

Inge, W. R., Christian Mysticism. The Bampton Lectures, 1899. Sixth ed. London: Methuen, 1923.

———. Outspoken Essays. (First Series), London: Longmans, 1920.

———. Personal Religion and the Life of Devotion. London and New York: Longmans, 1924.

James, William. The Varieties of Religious Experience. The Gifford Lectures, 1901-1902. New York: Longmans, 1902.

Jones, E. M., The Inner Life. New York: Macmillan, 1916.

———, "Mysticism (Introductory)," and "Quietism (Christian, R. C.)," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, ed. by James Hastings. New York: Scribner, 1917. Vol. IX, pp. 89 - 92, 89-90.

Jones, R. M., New Studies in Mystical Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

_____, Some Exponents of Mystical Religion. New York: Abingdon, 1930.

_____, Studies in Mystical Religion. London: Macmillan, 1909.

Leuba, J. H., The Psychology of Religious Mysticism. New York: Harcourt, 1925.

Montague, W. P., The Ways of Knowing. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1925.

Moore, G. F., History of Religions. New York: Scribner, Vol. I, 1913; Vol. II, 1919.

Otto, Rudolph, Das Heilige, 7 Aufl. Breslau: Trewendt und Granier, 1922. Eng. tr. from the 9th German ed., The Idea of the Holy, by J. W. Harvey. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1923.

_____, Mysticism East and West. Eng. tr. by B. L. Bracey and R. C. Payne. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Jones, R. M., New Studies in Mystical Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1927.

_____, Some Exponents of Mystical Religion. New York: Abingdon, 1930.

_____, Studies in Mystical Religion. London: Macmillan, 1909.

Leuba, J. H., The Psychology of Religious Mysticism. New York: Harcourt, 1925.

Montague, W. P., The Ways of Knowing. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1925.

Moore, G. F., History of Religions. New York: Scribner, Vol. I, 1913; Vol. II, 1919.

Otto, Rudolph, Das Heilige. 7 Aufl. Breslau: Trewendt und Trewler, 1923. Eng. tr. from the 9th German ed., The Idea of the Holy, by J. W. Harvey. London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1923.

_____, Mysticism East and West. Eng. tr. by B. L. Bracey and R. C. Payne. New York: Macmillan, 1932.

Peers, E. A., Spanish Mysticism. New York: Dutton, (preface date) 1924.

Pratt, J. B., The Religious Consciousness. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Pringle - Pattison, A. S., "Mysticism," Encyclopedia Brittanica, 11th ed. New York: Ency. Britt. Co., 1910. Vol. XIX, pp. 123 - 128.

Récéjac, Edouard, Essay on the Bases of Mystic Knowledge. Tr. by Sara Carr Utpon. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner, 1899.

Selbie, W. B., The Psychology of Religion. Oxford: Clarendon, 1924.

Sorley, W. R., Moral Values and the Idea of God. The Gifford Lectures, 1914 - 1915. Cambridge: University Press, 1918.

Strickland, F. L., Psychology of Religious Experience. New York: Abingdon, 1924.

Ten Broeke, James, The Moral Life and Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

Tyrrell, George, The Faith of the Millions. London: Longmans, 1902.

Spera, E. A.. Jesuian Mysticism. New York: Dutton, (preface date) 1924.

Pratt, J. B.. The Religious Consciousness. New York: Macmillan, 1920.

Pringle - Pattison, A. S.. "Mysticism," Encyclopedia Brittanica, 11th ed. New York: Amer. Brit. Co., 1910. Vol. XIX, pp. 123 - 128.

Rashdall, Edward. Essay on the Basis of Mystic Knowledge. Tr. by Sara Darr Upton. London: E. Paul, Trubner, 1892.

Sabine, W. B.. The Psychology of Religion. Oxford: Clarendon, 1924.

Sorley, W. R.. Moral Values and the Idea of God. The Gifford Lectures, 1914 - 1915. Cambridge: University Press, 1918.

Strickland, F. L.. Psychology of Religious Experience. New York: Abingdon, 1924.

Van Dusen, James. The Moral Life and Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

Tyrrell, George. The Faith of the Millions. London: Longmans, 1902.

Underhill, Evelyn, The Essentials of Mysticism and Other Essays. New York: Dutton, 1920.

_____, Mysticism. New York: Dutton, 1930. rev. ed.

_____, The Mystics of the Church. New York: Doran, no date.

_____, The Mystic Way. London: Dent, 1913.

_____, Practical Mysticism. New York: Dutton, 1915.

Vaughan, R. A., Hours with the Mystics. Two Vol. London: Parker and Son, 1860.

Watkins, E. I., The Philosophy of Mysticism. New York: Harcourt Brace and Howe, 1920.

Williams, H. H., "Ethics," Encyclopedia Brittanica, 11th ed. New York: Ency. Britt. Co., 1910. Vol. IX, pp. 807 ff., 821 ff.

Winkworth, Susanna, (translator) Theologia Germanica. ed. by Dr. Pfeiffer; intro. by translator; pref. by Chas. Kingsley. London: Macmillan, 1924. First published, 1874.

Underhill, Evelyn. The Essentials of Mysticism and Other Essays. New York: Dutton, 1920.

_____. Mysticism. New York: Dutton, 1930. rev. ed.

_____. The Mystics of the Church. New York: Doran, no date.

_____. The Mystic Way. London: Dent, 1913.

_____. Practical Mysticism. New York: Dutton, 1915.

Vaughan, R. A.. Hours with the Mystics. Two Vol. London: Parker and Son, 1860.

Watkins, E. I.. The Philosophy of Mysticism. New York: Harcourt Brace and Howe, 1920.

Williams, E. H.. "Ethics," Encyclopaedia Britannica. 11th ed. New York: Ency. Brit. Co., 1910. Vol. IX, pp. 807 ff., 881 ff.

Wulfert, Susanne, (translator) Theologia Germanica. ed. by Dr. Pfeiffer: intro. by translator; pref. by Chas. Kingsley. London: Macmillan, 1924. First published, 1874.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

II

Pauline and Related Studies

Abbott, T. K., "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1897.

Alexander, A. B. D., The Ethics of Paul. Glasgow: Maclehose, 1910.

Arnold, Matthew, St. Paul and Protestantism. London: Macmillan, 1870.

Bacon, B. W., Jesus and Paul. New York: Macmillan, 1921.

Bousset, Wilhelm, Kyrios Christos. Zweite umgearbeitete Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921.

Bruce, A. B., St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. New York: Scribner, 1911.

Bulcock, Harry, The Passing and the Permanent in St. Paul. London: Macmillan, 1926.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

II

Pauline and Related Studies

Abbott, T. K., "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1897.

Alexander, A. B. D., The Ethics of Paul. Glasgow: Neilshoes, 1910.

Arnold, Matthew, St. Paul and Protestantism. London: Macmillan, 1870.

Bacon, B. W., Jesus and Paul. New York: Macmillan, 1921.

Bousset, Wilhelm, Kyrios Christos. Zweite vergrösserte Aufl. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1921.

Bruce, A. B., St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. New York: Scribner, 1911.

Deissmann, Adolf, The Religion and the Personnel in St. Paul. London: Macmillan, 1926.

Burton, E. DeW. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1920.

_____, Spirit, Soul, and Flesh. Historical and Linguistic Studies, Second Series, Vol. III. Chicago: University Press, 1918.

Cadbury, H. J., "Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion," Studies in Early Christianity, ed. by S. J. Case. New York: Century, 1928.

Campbell, J. M., Paul the Mystic. New York: Putnam's, 1908.

Campbell, J. Y., "KOINΩNIA and its Cognates in the New Testament," Journal of Biblical Literature, Vol. LI, Part IV, (December, 1932), pp. 352 - 380.

Clelland, F. W., "Pauline Paradoxes, or Some Illogical and Paradoxical Aspects of Paul's Thought," (Doctor's Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School). Unpublished, 1932.

Cone, Orello, Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher. New York: Macmillan, 1898.

Burton, R. DeW. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1920.

_____. Smith, Goodspeed, and Mead. Historical and Linguistic Studies, Second Series, Vol. III. Chicago: University Press, 1918.

Cadbury, H. J. "Concurrent Phases of Paul's Religion." Studies in Early Christianity, ed. by S. J. Case. New York: Century, 1928.

Campbell, J. M. Paul the Mystic. New York: Putnam's, 1920.

Campbell, J. Y. "ΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΑ and its Congeries in the New Testament." Journal of Biblical Literature. Vol. LI, Part IV, (December, 1932), pp. 352 - 360.

Clelland, R. W. "Pauline Paradoxes, or Some Illogical and Paradoxical Aspects of Paul's Thought." (Doctor's Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School). Typewritten, 1932.

Cone, Orello. Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher. New York: Macmillan, 1896.

Cumont, Franz, The Oriental Religions in Roman Paganism. Authorized translation. Chicago: Open Court, 1911.

Deissmann, Adolf, Die Neutestamentliche Formel in Christo Jesu. Marburg: N. G. Elwent'sche, 1892. Later edd., Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

_____, Paulus, Eine kultur - und religionsgeschichtliche Skizze. Tübingen, Mohr, 1te Aufl., 1911; 2te Aufl., 1925. Eng. tr. of first German ed. by L. R. M. Strachan; of second German ed. by W. E. Wilson, St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911 and 1926.

_____, The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. Selly Oak Lectures, 1923. Tr. by W. E. Wilson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.

Deissner, Kurt, Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit. Leipzig: Deichert, 1921.

Tisdall, Evans.

The Oriental Religions in Jesus Christ. Authorized translation. Chicago: Open Court, 1911.

Teisenen, Adolf.

Die Jerusalemer Religion Jesu in Christo Gen. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche, 1898. Later edn., Tübingen, J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

———.

Paulus, Eine Kultur - und Religionsgeschichtliche Skizze. Tübingen, Mohr, Ite Aufl., 1911; 2te Aufl., 1924. Eng. tr. of first German ed. by L. R. M. Strachan; of second German ed. by W. E. Wilson, St. Paul, A Study in Social and Religious History. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911 and 1926.

———.

The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul. Hilly Oak lectures, 1923. Tr. by W. E. Wilson. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1926.

Teisener, Kurt.

Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit. Leipzig: Deichert, 1921.

Dexter, Dora L., "Paul's Terms as Illustrations and Patterns Rather Than Dogmatic Concepts." (Doctor's Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School). Unpublished, 1931.

Enslin, M. S., The Ethics of Paul. New York: Harper, 1930.

Ernesti, H. F. T. L., Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus. 1te Aufl., 1868; 2te Aufl., 1880. Göttingen.

Feine, Paul, St. Paul as a Theologian. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1908.

Foakes-Jackson, F. J., The Life of St. Paul. New York: Boni and Liverwright, 1926.

_____, The Rise of Gentile Christianity. New York: Doran, 1927.

_____, Studies in the Life of the Early Church. New York: Doran, 1924.

Frame, J. E., "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1912.

Dexter, Doris L. "Faust's Sorrow as Illustrations and Patterns Rather Than Dynamic Concepts." (Doctor's Dissertation, Boston University Graduate School). Duquesilabes, 1931.

Emslie, M. S. The Ethics of Faust. New York: Harper, 1930.

Ernesti, H. F. T. L. Die Ethik des Aeschylos Faustus. Ite Aufl., 1866; 2te Aufl., 1880. Göttingen.

Foley, Faust. St. Faust as a Theologian. New York: Eaton and Mains, 1908.

Jackson-Jackson, F. J. The Life of St. Paul. New York: Doubleday and Livewright, 1926.

_____. The Rise of Gentile Christianity. New York: Doran, 1927.

_____. Studies in the Life of the Early Church. New York: Doran, 1924.

Prime, J. E. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1912.

Gardner, Percy, The Religious Experience of St. Paul. New York: Putnam's, 1911.

Gilbert, G. H., The Student's Life of Paul. New York: Macmillan, 1907.

Glover, T. R., Paul of Tarsus. New York: Doran, 1925.

Headlam, A. C., St. Paul and Christianity. New York: Longmans, 1913.

Herford, R. T., Pharisaism, Its Aim and Method. New York: Putnam's, 1912.

Holmes, Arthur, The Mind of St. Paul. New York: Macmillan, 1929.

Hoyle, R. B., The Holy Spirit in St. Paul. New York: Doubleday Doran, 1928.

Jones, Maurice, The New Testament in the Twentieth Century. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Juncker, A., Die Ethik des Apostels Paulus. Halle: I, 1904; II, 1919.

Η ΚΑΙΝΗ ΔΙΑΘΗΚΗ. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1923. Text with Critical Apparatus. Collation by Eberhard Nestle. First ed., 1904.

Barbour, Percy. *The Religious Experiences of St. Paul.* New York: Putnam's, 1911.

Gilbert, G. H., *The Student's Life of Paul.* New York: Macmillan, 1907.

Glover, T. R., *Paul of Tarsus.* New York: Doran, 1928.

Headlam, A. C., *St. Paul and Christianity.* New York: Longmans, 1912.

Horford, R. T., *Pharisaism, Its Aim and Method.* New York: Putnam's, 1912.

Holmes, Arthur, *The Mind of St. Paul.* New York: Macmillan, 1922.

Hoyle, S. R., *The Holy Spirit in St. Paul.* New York: Doubleday Doran, 1922.

Jones, Maurice, *The New Testament in the Twentieth Century.* London: Macmillan, 1914.

Lamonier, A., *The Ethics des Apostels Paulus.* Halle: 1, 1904; II, 1919.

A NEW ALIGNMENT. London: British and Foreign Bible Society, 1922. Text with Critical Apparatus. Collation by Sherbrand Hostie. First ed., 1906.

Kennedy, H. A. A., St. Paul and the Mystery Religions. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.

Lake, Kirsopp, Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. 2nd ed. London: Rivington, 1914.

_____, Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

_____, Paul. New York: Oxford, 1934.

Lightfoot, J. B., Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. London: Macmillan, 1892.

_____, The Epistle to the Galatians. 9th ed. London: Macmillan, 1887.

_____, St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. 9th ed. London: Macmillan, 1890.

_____, St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. 6th ed. London: Macmillan, 1890.

Locke, W., "The Pastoral Epistles," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1924.

Kennedy, B. A. A. St. Paul and the Western Religions. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1913.

Lake, Kirsopp. Earlier Epistles of St. Paul. 2nd ed. London: Rivington, 1914.

_____. Landmarks in the History of Early Christianity. New York: Macmillan, 1922.

_____. Paul. New York: Oxford, 1924.

Lightfoot, J. B. Dissertations on the Apostolic Age. London: Macmillan, 1892.

_____. The Epistle to the Galatians. 5th ed. London: Macmillan, 1887.

_____. St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon. 9th ed. London: Macmillan, 1920.

_____. St. Paul's Epistle to the Philippians. 6th ed. London: Macmillan, 1890.

Lodge, T. "The Pastoral Epistles." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1924.

Lowstuter, W. J., Paul, Campaigner for Christ. New York: Abingdon, 1915.

Machen, J. G., The Origin of Paul's Religion. New York: Macmillan, 1921.

Mackenzie, W. D., "Jesus Christ," Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. New York: Scribner, 1917. Ed. by James Hastings. Vol VII, pp. 505-551.

Martin, William, St. Paul's Ethical Teaching. London: Humphreys, 1917.

Matheson, George, The Spiritual Development of St. Paul. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1890.

McGiffert, A. C., A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age. Rev. ed. New York: Scribner, 1917.

Michael, J. H., "The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians," The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. New York: Doubleday Doran, 1929.

Moffatt, James, An Approach to the New Testament. 3rd. ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.

_____, Grace in the New Testament. New York: Long and Smith, 1932.

_____, Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament. New York: Scribner, 1917.

_____, Love in the New Testament. New York: Smith, 1930.

Moore, G. F., Judaism in the First Century of the Christian Era. 3 Vol. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Morgan, W., The Religion and Theology of Paul. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1917.

McGiffert, A. C.. *A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age.* Rev. ed. New York: Scribner, 1917.

Michael, J. H.. "The Epistle of Paul to the Philippians." *The Moffatt New Testament Commentary.* New York: Doubleday, Doran, 1929.

Moffatt, James. *An Approach to the New Testament.* 3rd. ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1927.

_____. *Grace in the New Testament.* New York: Long and Smith, 1932.

_____. *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament.* New York: Scribner, 1917.

_____. *Love in the New Testament.* New York: Smith, 1930.

Moore, G. F.. *Judaism in the First Century of the Christian Era.* 3 Vol. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Morgan, R.. *The Religion and Theology of Paul.* Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1917.

Mundle, Wilhelm, Das Religiöse Leben des Apostels Paulus. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.

Peabody, F. G., The Apostle Paul and the Modern World. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Pfleiderer, Otto, Der Paulinismus. Leipzig: Fues, 1873. Eng. tr. by Edward Peters, Paulinism. 2 Vol. London: Williams and Norgate, 1877.

_____, Primitive Christianity. 4 Vol. Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery; edited by W. Montgomery and W. D. Morrison. New York: Putnam's, 1906 - 1911.

Plummer, Alfred, "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1915.

Porter, F. C., The Mind of Christ in Paul. New York: Scribner, 1930.

Ramsay, W. M., St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen. New York: Putnam's, 1896.

Bindle, Wilhelm. Das Zeitalter Louis des Xiv. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1923.

Cabody, H. C. The Apostle Paul and the Modern World. New York: Macmillan, 1923.

Fischer, Otto. Der Zeitgeist. Leipzig: Eno, 1877. Eng. tr. by Edward Fabers, Zeitgeist. 2 Vol. London: Williams and Norgate, 1877.

_____. Primitive Christianity. 4 Vol. Eng. tr. by M. Montgomery; edited by W. Montgomery and W. D. Morrison. New York: Putnam's, 1906 - 1911.

Hammer, Alfred. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Second Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1915.

Foster, J. C. The Mind of Christ in Paul. New York: Scribner, 1930.

Ramsay, W. M. St. Paul, the Traveller and Roman Citizen. New York: Putnam's, 1896.

Ramsay, W. M., The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day. 2nd. ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1914.

Rattenbury, J. E., The Religious Experience of St. Paul. Nashville: Cokesbury, 1931.

Rawlinson, A. E. J., The New Testament Doctrine of Christ. London: Longmans, 1926.

Reitzenstein, R., Hellenistischen Mysterienreligionen. Leipzig: Tuebner, 1910.

Robertson, A., and Plummer, A., "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1911.

Robinson, B. W., The Life of Paul. 2nd. ed. Chicago: University Press, 1928.

Robinson, J. W., St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. 2nd. ed. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Ropes, J. H., The Apostolic Age. New York: Scribner, 1908.

Barnsley, W. M.. *The Teaching of Paul in Terms of the Present Day*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1924.

Battenbury, J. R.. *The Religious Experience of St. Paul*. Nashville: Cokesbury, 1937.

Bawlinson, A. E. J.. *The New Testament Teaching of Christ*. London: Longmans, 1926.

Beltzenstein, R.. *Hellenistischen Wunderlehrlichen*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1910.

Robertson, A., and Plummer, A.. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians." *The International Critical Commentary*. New York: Scribner, 1911.

Robinson, E. W.. *The Life of Paul*. 2nd. ed. Chicago: University Press, 1923.

Robinson, J. W.. *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*. 2nd. ed. London: Macmillan, 1914.

Tobee, J. R.. *The Apostolic Age*. New York: Scribner, 1902.

Ropes, J. H., "The Epistle to the Romans and Jewish Christianity." Studies in Early Christianity. Ed. by S. J. Case. New York: Century, 1928.

Royse, C. D., "The Psychology of Saul's Conversion," American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education. Vol. I - II, pp. 143 - 154.

Sabatier, Auguste, L' apôtre Paul (1881). Eng. tr. by A. M. Hellier, The Apostle Paul. 2nd. ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1891.

Sanday, W., and Headlam, A. C., "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1926.

Schmidt, Traugott, Der Leib Christi. Leipzig: Deichert, 1919.

Schmitz, Otto, "Die Christus-Gemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Genitivs Gebrauchs," Neutest. - Forschungen, 1 Reihe: Paulus Studien. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1924.

Schweitzer, Albert, Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung, (1911). Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery, Paul and His Interpreters. London: Black, 1912.

Noyes, J. H.. "The Relatia to the Zoanna and Jewish Christianity." Studies in Early Christianity. Ed. by Shad. Case. New York: Century, 1928.

Noyes, G. C.. "The Psychology of Saul's Conversion." American Journal of Religious Psychology and Education. Vol. I - II, pp. 163 - 184.

Sabatier, Auguste. L' apôtre Paul (1896). Eng. tr. by A. Z. Miller. The Apostle Paul. 2nd. ed. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1896.

Sanday, W.. and Headlam, A. C.. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Relatia to the Romans." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1902.

Schmidt, Traugott. Der Lieb Christi. Leipzig: Heinrich. 1919.

Schmitz, Otto. "Die Christus-Gemeinschaft des Paulus in ihrer reinen Positiven Gebrauche." Neutest. - Forschungen. I Reihe: Paulus Studien. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1922.

Schweitzer, Albert. Geschichte der paulinischen Forschung (1911). Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery. Paul and His Interpreters. London: Black. 1912.

Schweitzer, Albert, Die Mystik des Apostels Paulus, (1929). Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery, with prefatory note by F. C. Burkitt, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. New York: Holt, 1931.

Scott, C. A. A., Christianity According to St. Paul. London: Cambridge University Press, 1927.

_____, Living Issues in the New Testament. Cambridge: University Press, 1933.

Scott, E. F., The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

_____, The Spirit in the New Testament. New York: Doran, 1923.

Smith, David, The Life and Letters of St. Paul. New York: Doran, 1920.

Sommerlath, Ernst, Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus. Leipzig: Dörffling, 1926.

Stevens, G. B., The Pauline Theology. New York: Scribner, 1892.

Strachan, R. H., The Individuality of St. Paul. London: J. Clarke, 1916.

Schweitzer, Albert. The Mystik des Apostels Paulus. (1929). Eng. tr. by W. Montgomery, with preface by F. C. Burkitt. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. New York: Holt, 1931.

Scott, C. A. A.. Christianity According to St. Paul. London: Cambridge University Press, 1927.

_____. Living Issues in the New Testament. Cambridge: University Press, 1932.

Scott, E. F.. The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. New York: Macmillan, 1924.

_____. The Spirit in the New Testament. New York: Doran, 1923.

Smith, David. The Life and Letters of St. Paul. New York: Doran, 1920.

Sommerlath, Ernst. Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus. Leipzig: Dörffling, 1922.

Stevens, G. B.. The Pauline Theology. New York: Scribner, 1892.

Strachan, R. H.. The Individuality of St. Paul. London: J. Clarke, 1919.

Streeter, B. H. (editor) et al., The Spirit. New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Thayer, J. H., A Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: Harper, 1898.

Toy, C. H., Judaism and Christianity. Boston: Little Brown, 1892.

Vincent, M. R., "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and Philemon," The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1897.

Walker, Williston, History of the Christian Church. New York: Scribner, 1918.

Weber, Emil, "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu' und die Paulinische Christus Mystik," Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, XXXI, 5.

Weber, Wilhelm, Christus Mystik. Eine religionspsychologische Darstellung der paulinischen Christusfrömmigkeit. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1924.

Weinel, Heinrich, Paulus, der Mensch und Sein Werk. Tübingen: Mohr, 1904. Eng. tr. by G. A. Brenemann; ed. by W. D. Morrison, St. Paul, the Man and His Work. New York: Putnam's, 1908.

Streeter, B. H. (editor) et al.. The Spirit. New York: Macmillan, 1919.

Thayer, J. H.. A Greek - English Lexicon of the New Testament. New York: Harper, 1889.

Tov, G. H.. Judaism and Christianity. Boston: Little Brown, 1932.

Vincent, M. R.. "A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles to the Philippians and Philemon." The International Critical Commentary. New York: Scribner, 1927.

Walker, Williston. History of the Christian Church. New York: Scribner, 1918.

Weber, Karl. "Die Formel 'in Christo Jesu' und die Realität jedes Christens Lebens." Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift. Kiel, 0.

Weber, Wilhelm. Christus Lebt. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Darstellung der traditionellen Christusfrömmigkeit. Gütersloh: Mohnkohn, 1924.

Weinel, Heinrich. Paulus, der Mensch und Sein Werk. Tübingen: Mohr, 1904. Eng. tr. by G. A. Bremmann; ed. by W. D. Morrison, St. Paul, the Man and His Work. New York: Putnam's, 1906.

Weiss, Johannes, Kritisch-Exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament. Gottingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892.

_____, Das Urchristentum. Zwei Bände. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917.

_____, Paul and Jesus. Eng. tr. by H. J. Chaytor. New York: Harper, 1909.

Weizäcker, Carl von, Apostolische Zeitalter. Freiburg: Mohr, 1892. Eng. tr. by James Millar, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. 2 Vol. New York: Putnam's, 1894.

Wendt, H. H., Lehre Jesu. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1886. Zwei Bände. Eng. tr. by John Wilson, 2nd. Ed., 2 Vol. The Teachings of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1892 - 1899.

Wernle, Paul, The Beginnings of Christianity. Eng. tr. by G. A. Bienemann, with intro. by W. D. Morrison. New York: Putnam's, 1903-1904.

Wrede, Wilhelm, Paulus. Tübingen: 1905. Eng. tr. by Edward Lummis, Paul. London: Philip Green, 1907.

Weiss, Johannes. Christlich-katholischer Commentar über das Neue Testament. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1892.

———. Das Urchristentum. Zwei Bände. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1917.

———. Paul and Jesus. Eng. tr. by H. J. Chaytor. New York: Harper, 1909.

Wellhausen, Carl von. Apostolische Zeitalter. Freiburg: Mohr, 1892. Eng. tr. by James Miller, The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church. 2 Vol. New York: Putnam's, 1894.

Wendt, H. H. Lehre Jesu. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1886. Zwei Bände. Eng. tr. by John Wilson, 2nd. Ed., 2 Vol. The Teaching of Jesus. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1888 - 1892.

Werner, Paul. The Beginnings of Christianity. Eng. tr. by G. A. Biscoe, with intro. by W. D. Morrison. New York: Putnam's, 1903-1904.

Wrede, Wilhelm. Paulus. Tübingen: 1907. Eng. tr. by Edward Lummis, Paul. London: Philip Green, 1907.

A U T O B I O G R A P H Y

William Emory Hartman, the candidate, was born in Freeland, Pennsylvania, November 7, 1900. His father, William Wade Hartman, was a graduate of Williamsport Dickinson Seminary and Drew Theological Seminary, and previous to his death in 1922, served for twenty-seven years as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Central Pennsylvania Conference. The candidate's mother, Hester Anne Tubbs Hartman, resides in Delaware, Ohio.

The candidate was graduated from the Harrisburg (Pennsylvania) Central High School in 1917. In 1921 he received the A. B. degree from Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, and in 1924 the S. T. B. degree from the Boston University School of Theology. Enrolling in the Graduate School of Boston University in 1924, he continued his studies in Boston until 1926. As Frank D. Howard Fellow he spent 1926-1927 in study at the Universities of Strasbourg, Berlin, and Oxford. During the academic year 1927-1928 he served as Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy, Psychology, and Education of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania. From 1928 to 1932 he served successively as pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Berwick, Pennsylvania, and of The Wesley Foundation, St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, State College, Pennsylvania. He

A U T O B I O G R A P H Y

William Henry Hartman, the candidate, was born in Freeland, Pennsylvania, November 7, 1900. His father, William Hale Hartman, was a graduate of Williamsport Dickinson Seminary and Drew Theological Seminary, and previous to his death in 1922, served for twenty-seven years as a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Central Pennsylvania Conference. The candidate's mother, Hester Anne Tubbs Hartman, resides in Delaware, Ohio.

The candidate was graduated from the Harrisburg (Pennsylvania) Central High School in 1921. In 1923 he received the A. B. degree from Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio, and in 1924 the B. D. degree from the Boston University School of Theology. Enrolling in the Graduate School of Boston University in 1924, he continued his studies in Boston until 1926. As Frank D. Howard Fellow he spent 1926-1927 in study at the Universities of Strasbourg, Berlin, and Oxford. During the academic year 1927-1928 he served as Assistant Professor in the Department of Philosophy, Psychology, and Education of Allegheny College, Meadville, Pennsylvania. From 1928 to 1932 he served successively as pastor of Calvary Methodist Episcopal Church, Ferndale, Pennsylvania, and of the Wesley Foundation, St. Paul's Methodist Episcopal Church, State College, Pennsylvania. He

is at present pastor of Allison Memorial Methodist Episcopal Church, Carlisle, Pennsylvania.

In 1924 the candidate was united in marriage to Naomi Dorcas Gum, of Martinsville, Indiana.